

American

25 CENTS

MERCURY

Copy 2

Are the Churches Failing Our GI's?

Dangers, Dilemmas and Dulles

The "New" Soviet Anti-Semitism

Civil Liberties Upside Down

The Sad Story of Lamar Caudle

To Our Readers —

For the next several months the change of administration in Washington will dominate all thoughtful publications, from the daily press to the very, very erudite quarterlies. That is properly so. The control of our government by the Republican Party after twenty years of New Deal and Fair Deal is the most important event of the time. The changes in personnel, the new policies adopted, the old ones discarded or retained, will be matters of interest to all thinking Americans.

It is only natural that many publications are currently going far out on their editorial limbs to prognosticate the policies President Eisenhower will adopt, and even evaluate their potential effects on national and international affairs. That is a sort of political soothsaying which we at AMERICAN MERCURY intend to avoid. We will wait until President Eisenhower's policies fully unfold, and can be accurately and fairly evaluated. Then, and only then, we will provide our readers with vigorous, probing, analytical articles on the new programs — articles written by qualified writers in the respective fields, and presented for the purpose of provoking thoughtful discussion.

Meanwhile, we shall lay the proper groundwork by analyzing some of the more important problems that the new administration must solve, in hope that such analyses will help you formulate sound opinions in the important debates that must precede the adoption of proposed solutions. We suggest that you follow the doings of President Eisenhower and his aides through THE MERCURY, by filling out the subscription blank attached to this issue, and mailing it — along with a check, of course — to our offices.

The Editors

American

MERCURY

VOLUME LXXVI
NUMBER 351

A MAGAZINE OF IDEAS MARCH-APRIL 1953

Founded by Henry L. Mencken

Are the Churches Failing our GI's? <i>Scott Hershey and Harry Tennant</i>	3
From Cinema to Cinerama <i>Milton Klonsky</i>	14
The "New" Soviet Anti-Semitism <i>Victor Riesel</i>	19
A Last Visit with Santayana <i>Wilbert Snow</i>	28
Civil Liberties Upside Down <i>J. B. Matthews</i>	34
Agenda for the Second Elizabethan Age <i>A. L. Rowse</i>	50
The Sizzling Seat of Herbert Brownell <i>James Andrew Mayer</i>	55
The Sad Story of Lamar Caudle <i>Ralph de Toledano</i>	63
In The MERCURY's Opinion	75
Robert Morris <i>Howard Rushmore</i>	78
Dangers, Dilemmas and Dulles <i>Patrick McMahon</i>	86
The Federalist Papers	97
They're All Anti-Communists Now <i>Harold Lord Varney</i>	104
Down to Earth: Lady, a Horse <i>Alan Devoe</i>	113
Books in Review <i>Frank Meyer</i>	118

THIRTIETH YEAR OF PUBLICATION

LAST November millions of Americans went to the polls for the first time in many years — many for the first time in their lives, and discharged their duties as citizens.

In so doing they made abundantly clear — and effective — their desire for a change in government.

However, our obligation as citizens does not end with the casting of our ballots.

We have the far greater and more difficult obligation to weigh every plan and proposal of the new administration, to form intelligent opinions, and to express those opinions freely to our representatives in Congress. We have the responsibility to call attention to every error of omission and commission, and to urge immediate remedy.

An Important function of AMERICAN MERCURY will be to present to our readers the things that we think need changing in the national capital.

RUSSELL MAGUIRE
Chairman of the Board

The American Mercury Magazine, Inc.

JOHN A. CLEMENTS, *Editor*

•
PATRICK McMAHON, *Washington Editor*

•
ROBERT HODGSON, *Business Manager*

ROBERT W. REDMOND, *Circulation Director*

ALMA E. DREWES, *Subscription Manager*

LOIS HANSEN, ADRIENNE SUDDARD, *Editorial Assistants*

Published monthly except the combined issues of March and April by the American Mercury Magazine, Inc., at 25 cents a copy. Annual subscription \$3.00 in U. S. and possessions; \$3.50 in Canada; \$4.00 in all other countries. Publication office, Concord, N. H. Editorial and General Offices, 11 East 36th Street, New York 16, N. Y. Printed in the U. S. A. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Concord, N. H., September 29, 1936, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1953 by American Mercury Magazine, Inc. All rights, including translation into other languages, reserved. Protection secured under the International Copyright Convention and the Pan American Copyright Convention. No articles may be reprinted in whole or part without permission. Not responsible for the return of unsolicited manuscripts unless stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed.



ARE THE Churches FAILING OUR GI's?

By SCOTT HERSHEY *and*
HARRY TENNANT



EACH YEAR for the next few years — and as far ahead as we can see — more than a million young men and women will be uprooted from their homes and their communities and drafted or enlisted into the armed forces. Another million annually will be mustered back into civilian life as service alumni.

A generation from now these young men and young women will be expected to provide the political, the social and the economic leadership of the nation. And the manner in which they fulfill these expectations will depend to a large degree on the imprints left upon their characters by their tenure of service in the armed forces.

This very obvious fact is the source of increasing alarm among the chaplains in all echelons of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. They believe that the most important factor in building the character of young men and women — their spiritual life and guidance — is being badly neglected as far as those in the armed forces are concerned.

A study of the situation reveals that the armed forces themselves, the Congress, and the public must all share some of the blame. But, in the opinion of the chief chaplains of the services, the major responsibility — and the major failure — is that of the churches themselves.

The grave apprehension of the service chaplains is illustrated by the retirement last month of the Chief Chaplain of the United States Navy, Rear Admiral S. W. Salisbury, a vigorous, active, outspoken man. He announced his retirement at the age of 62, so that he can devote his full time to maintaining contacts with church leaders and seminarians throughout the nation, acquainting them with the seriousness of the situation, and urging them and their churches to develop positive, detailed programs to meet their challenge.

"We are a military state, whether we like it or not — and most of us do not," he said. "Nevertheless, the fact that we have been forced into a military state in time of peace — or semipeace — demands that our

churches develop new techniques and new programs, if they are to fulfill their spiritual responsibilities to our young GI men and women."

THE Chief Chaplains of the Army and the Air Force, Major Generals Ivan Loveridge Bennett and Charles I. Carpenter, are in full agreement with Admiral Salisbury regarding the gravity of the challenge. And with varying degrees of emphasis they concur in Admiral Salisbury's opinion, that, while most of the churches did an excellent job of meeting the spiritual problems of the GI during the two World Wars, they have failed sadly to meet the entirely different, and unprecedented, problem resulting from the mobilization of 3,500,000 men and women in the armed forces in time of troubled peace.

The Armed Forces Chaplains Board, of which these three clergymen are members, was created by the Secretary of Defense to advise him on spiritual and moral problems in the services. It is composed of the three Chiefs of Chaplains, Army, Navy and Air Force, and one additional representative from each service. Its purpose is to make possible a unified approach to the moral and spiritual and other related problems within the services.

"Many denominations have failed miserably to keep pace with the current needs of youth in the service," General Carpenter, who is chairman of the Armed Forces

Chaplains Board, declared. "Their apathetic attitude is illustrated by a recent meeting of the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches, at which I spoke in behalf of the service chaplains.

"Only 25 minutes, of a three-day conference, was devoted to the discussion of the spiritual problems of the men and women of the Army, Navy and Air Force."

Admiral Salisbury, who addressed the conference in 1951, noted that "it was not until two years ago that the conference even acknowledged that the problem existed."

CURIOUSLY enough the three Chief Chaplains, General Carpenter a Methodist, General Bennett a Southern Baptist, and Admiral Salisbury a Presbyterian, agree that the problem is predominantly a Protestant one. They feel that the Catholic Church and the Jewish faiths are fully aware of the needs of their youth in the service, and have taken adequate steps to meet them.

"The Catholic Church, by its very nature, leaves it up to the individual to maintain contact with the church — whether in or out of the service," Admiral Salisbury said. "Members of the Jewish faith, individualistic in nature, are drawn together by the tenets of their religion. Consequently, these two faiths are not beset by the same problems which plague the Protestant churches."

Chaplains in all branches of the service report they receive excellent cooperation from the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Jewish Welfare Board.

Many Catholic high schools and universities have established excellent pre-induction courses for their students. In these courses, the prospective recruit is advised that military service is a part of life, not a detached period in which the moral standards he adheres to at home can be temporarily suspended. He is counselled to prepare himself mentally, physically and spiritually for his new experience. He is informed of the various programs in the armed forces in which he can participate to the advantage of his chosen career. He is given lectures, illustrated by motion pictures, to guide him in such problems as marriage and his relations with men and women of other races, creeds and nationalities, of other habits and customs.

Similar programs have been adopted by a few nonsectarian schools, Protestant churches and isolated communities. But they are all too few.

WITH a few notable exceptions the Protestant sects have fallen down on the job. They have failed to indoctrinate their young on the spiritual problems and responsibilities they will face on entering the service. They have failed to maintain contact with their members after they have been called to duty.

They have ignored the spiritual and social requirements of members of their faiths stationed in nearby Army, Navy and Air Force installations.

And, probably most important of all, many denominations have refused to make their best young ministers available for chaplain duty. Some faiths have even failed to provide enough ministers to fill the modest quotas of chaplains assigned to them, quotas which are based on the number of men and women of their faith in the services.

"Many of the churches are saying that they cannot give us their best men," said General Carpenter. "Most of them are saying that they can't give us more men because the demand for them in civilian life is too great. Church leaders are giving us all kinds of alibis to evade their obligation of providing an adequate number of competent young ministers for chaplain duty."

One of the paradoxes of the problem is that, while the churches are actively fighting Communism and are a bulwark against this threat to our liberty and freedom, they are overlooking an opportunity to engage this godless enemy directly by ministering to the spiritual needs of their young men and women on military duty.

"All churches deplore the inroads of Communism," General Carpenter said, "yet many of them are shortsighted, failing to realize that, while we are actively fighting Com-

munism overseas, they are indifferent to the influence of godlessness at home.

"We have reached the place, as we approach this entire new concept of militarism in American life, where it isn't enough to sit down and argue about peace and war and what Christ said about military service.

"That isn't our problem. Our problem is — what are we going to do with the kids who are on duty in the service of the Kingdom of God, today?"

ADMIRAL SALISBURY deplored the attitude of many churchmen and educators who put forward the idea that a tour of military duty is something to be "stoically endured," that it is simply two years out of the life of the young men.

"Nonsense," said Admiral Salisbury. "It is a time of growth and development, during which they need proper guidance. These young men can't develop if they have the attitude that they can drop the church for two years, and then go back again when they return home; that they can ignore their moral training until their tour of duty is over; or that after a spiritual vacation they will suddenly become men of character in their own communities, when their military service is ended."

The military spiritual heads were reluctant to discuss recent disclosures of widespread desertions. However, one chaplain remarked that

the record showed that many deserters were unable to adjust themselves to a new mode of life, because of a lack of spiritual and moral discipline at home.

For example, General Carpenter said that, at one Air Force indoctrination center, a recent check showed the startling fact that "religious illiteracy" of young men entering the center ranged between 15 and 28 per cent. He explained that these young men had no background of religious training or spiritual guidance to the extent that it had impressed itself upon their characters.

He feels that it is just as important for the churches to develop programs to reach these young men as it is to maintain their contacts with those who are being separated from their regular church for the first time in their lives.

The Chief Chaplains found considerable irony in a recent statement issued by the Kremlin, expressing alarm at the drift of Russian young people toward the church. Steps would be taken, the Soviet leaders warned ominously, to end this dangerous trend.

"We have warned the heads of the U. S. churches," General Carpenter said, "that continued neglect of their responsibility to the youth now in service is producing the same results that the Kremlin seeks, but without such a frank statement of purpose.

"The future of the churches of America is being sabotaged by their

own apparent unwillingness to meet the spiritual needs of the men and women who are wearing their country's uniform today."

THE chaplains of all ranks and all denominations point out that the problem the nation faces on the spiritual front today is far different from that in World War II, when a total of 22,000,000 young men and women served varying periods in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard and Merchant Marine.

"The very existence of war provided a certain spiritual exultation to many young men and women," one young chaplain remarked. "Then, too, the issues were brought into sharper focus, the need for great personal sacrifice more clearly defined. More important, we were a nation united in a single, recognizable purpose, and nearly everybody played his part — the churches, the communities and the individuals.

"The problems of the peacetime army are far different. There is little if any spiritual uplift felt by the young men and women who are drafted, or reluctantly enlisted into the armed forces. Many of them find military life, at its best, an irksome duty; at its worst, an intolerable existence. The issues at stake are no longer so clearly defined. And, most unfortunate, there is division among their elders as to the purpose and need of the sacrifices they are making. Their need for spiritual direc-

tion and strength is even greater than the needs of their elder brothers and sisters a few years ago, or their fathers during World War I."

Yet it is this greater need that is being so sorely neglected by church and community — both of which responded so splendidly to the lesser challenges of two world wars — in the opinions of the chaplains. Within a few years more than 10 million young men and women will have spent an average of two years in service — and spiritual isolation. When they return to civilian life, as Admiral Salisbury pointed out, "they will bring back with them the imprint of their service life, their observations and their experiences in countries in which they have served."

General Bennett, who has served 31 years in the Army, and recently completed a three-year tour of duty as Command Chaplain, Far East Command, put it this way:

"We cannot afford to neglect the problems resulting from the large increase of our military establishment — a situation that has no foreseeable end. It is almost trite, but obviously true, to say that the life of the church of tomorrow depends on the men in the service today."

The same thought was expressed in different words by Capt. E. L. Ackiss, Chief Chaplain, USN, Retired:

"Strong measures by our theological seminaries, our churches and our synagogues, and by our religious

communities to meet this continuing emergency in the lives of our young people, are an absolute necessity for the survival both of our religion and of our nation."

A FEW of the Protestant sects are taking steps in the right direction. The Chief Chaplains agree that the Armed Forces Commission of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, is doing an outstanding job. The Southern Baptists recently embarked on a comprehensive program to keep in touch with their young men and women in the armed forces. The Presbyterian Church has started a similar program, but on only a limited and experimental basis. The American Bible Society was praised for providing a million and a quarter Bibles to troops in Korea. All these programs are excellent, the chaplains say, but they are too limited in scope, and too few in number.

One particularly vexing problem in maintaining the morale — and the morals — of large armed forces in peacetime is that of providing proper recreational facilities and social activities, particularly to troops away from their posts. Military authorities have little trouble with the GI as long as he is within the confines of the military establishment. There, recreational and social opportunities are provided.

Obviously, however, there is a limit to the time that American young men and women outside the

combat areas can be restricted to the limits of their military posts, without a serious loss of morale. It is when the young GI, man or woman, is "out on the town" that trouble is usually encountered.

And here again, the chaplains believe, the churches must accept a full share of the responsibility. For a substantial proportion of the trouble that members of our armed forces get into would be avoided if the churches in the communities near military posts would develop recreational and social programs for the service people of their faith.

"The opportunity for young servicemen to join in church-sponsored recreational groups is an integral part of their spiritual training," General Carpenter said. "This is particularly true of Protestant youth which has always looked to the church to provide social activities.

"But in community after community the local churches have ignored the recreational needs of the men and women stationed at nearby military and naval installations."

AS A RESULT of this dereliction, hundreds of thousands of unsophisticated young service men and women who might otherwise be attending church socials, are drawn into cheap dance halls, disreputable night clubs, clip-joints and sordid dives. They are subjected to temptations that either did not exist in their own communities, or, if they did exist, they were able to resist

because of the strength of their ties with home and church. Deprived of that strength, they often fall easy victim to the hordes of chiselers, sharpers, professional gamblers and prostitutes who prey on lonely, restless servicemen. The results are frequently a serious undermining of the victim's moral fiber; sometimes sudden tragedy, imprisonment, and even violent death.

Many churches feel they have discharged their obligation to service people when they announce, through the chaplain, the time and place of their services and social functions.

In this attitude the chaplains feel that the church is simply following the pattern of so many communities which regard the serviceman as merely a source of revenue; not as a fellow Christian to be accepted and welcomed into the community's social life. There are relatively few churches, the chaplains say, which have gone directly to the servicemen of their faith, at nearby installations, and invited them to become a part of their congregation, and participate fully in all its activities.

There are some exceptions. Admiral Salisbury noted that "pitifully few" churches in Washington, D. C., conduct sightseeing tours of the nation's capital for servicemen, ending with church or young people's devotions. He mentioned Jacksonville, Florida, as a community which has "Projects for Servicemen" and provides them with maps of various

churches and other points of interest in the city. The San Diego City Federation of Churches has a "Friends Finder Service," which takes servicemen into church homes in the area and arranges for them to attend services in the local churches with these families.

At the top of the list of communities which have recognized the problem and in which the churches and local businessmen have united to meet it, is Belleville, Ill. Admiral Salisbury said this community, which had one of the worst records about a year ago, is now almost a model of what can be done to provide spiritual and recreational guidance for the servicemen stationed near there.

THE Department of Defense feels it has discharged its obligations in the spiritual field by the support it gives through the Corps of Chaplains. The assistance given, however, is in some cases limited. For example, the Navy Chaplains last year requested a \$900,000 appropriation for their work. By the time the Defense Department, the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress got through with this request it was slashed to less than one-third that amount. There are about 900 Navy Chaplains. The funds made available amounted to about \$300 per chaplain and this broken down further shows the ridiculously low figure of between 35 and 40 cents per man per year.

The Navy Chaplain's office sub-

mitted a budget request for \$1,026,000 in the current budget now before the Congress. By the time this request went through the Pentagon and the Bureau of the Budget the amount was reduced to \$300,000. This amounts to about \$333.33 per chaplain, which is an increase of \$33.33 per chaplain over the previous year — if the Congress does not further reduce it. Compare this with the \$46 billion dollars requested in the new budget for the armed services.

In the matter of the construction of chapels, a benevolent government is equally remiss. For example: In the Navy the construction of chapels is under the Bureau of Yards and Docks shore development program. Navy chaplains, who serve the Marine Corps, have been trying since 1940 to obtain funds for a suitable and adequate chapel at Quantico Marine Base. Recently the Chief of Chaplains of the Navy was advised that construction of a chapel had finally made the shore development list. He was exuberant. His exuberance chilled somewhat when he was further advised that the chapel was thirty-third on the list. Thirty-third turned out to be last on the list. What was the thirty-second project on the list? Construction of stables.

WHILE all three services could use more chaplains, the Navy seems to have less difficulty filling its quota than do the Army and the Air Force. General Bennett said that the

Army is presently short about 200 chaplains. The Air Force is having difficulty in filling its quota. The Navy is on the alert for chaplains, but primarily to meet replacement needs.

Admiral Salisbury has pointed out that, while the chaplaincy in the past has been an emergency service, "from here on out for our generation, the military chaplaincy will rank in the church as a regular form of Christian service for ordained ministers of the Gospel."

"It has become a calling as valid and as important as the foreign missionary, or the home pastorate," Admiral Salisbury said. "It represents a great opportunity and challenge and, by the strong support of her chaplains, the church is ultimately contributing to the enriching and strengthening of her own life."

At a recent Pentagon conference for religious leaders, delegates were told by a Chaplains Corps spokesman that "there isn't a church represented here today that isn't throwing into the mission fields of the world everything it can throw. In many instances you are having to overcome the greatest obstacles to bring the gospel into the hearts of men. Here stands an agency of government — the Corps of Chaplains — which opens its arms and says please come and hear our words, and the ear of the church is turned against it and the leadership that is needed of the church is absolutely neglected."

Refuting the alibis of many churches for their failure to provide qualified chaplains, military leaders believe, is the current emphasis given by many denominations to placing student pastors in institutions of higher learning. Military men contend that the armed services today have become the greatest educational institution in the country. Yet one denomination had less than 200 chaplains with the military services, and more than 400 student pastors in colleges and universities.

In one branch of the service, strength is about twice what it was a year ago. In order to obtain chaplains, this branch called every reserve chaplain 48 years of age and under, in the grade of major and below. An official charged with this task said, "It was like pulling teeth to get some of the men who held definite reserve commissions." The chief difficulty was not the refusal of the chaplain himself, but that of religious leaders, church officials, and even politicians who wrote letters insisting that these men be deferred to serve in their home communities.

In discussing the church's relationship with the Army, General Bennett explained: "Of course the local communities cannot be drained of spiritual leadership by the services, with a resulting deterioration of morals and moral standards among the civilian population.

"It is necessary to maintain a balance between the men and

women on the home front and those in the armed services. It takes all these men and women to make up the nation and we must keep in mind the welfare of the country as a whole."

UNDER present procedure the services ask the various churches to provide chaplains, according to the number of men and women under arms. The quotas are allotted among Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religions on the basis of the number of men of each faith in the services. In addition to certain physical and mental requirements, the chaplains must meet other standards necessitated by the unusual aspects of their missions in the armed forces.

General Bennett pointed out that about 70 per cent of the men studying for the ministry or the priesthood today are former servicemen. A large percentage of the chaplains who served in World War II were reserve officers. Many of these have returned to active duty status, but many more are unavailable because of age and grade limitations.

The Chaplains Corps does not have the responsibility of providing chaplains. The churches do have this responsibility.

"The churches must face the fact that this mission field is the place in which they need to put men," said General Carpenter, "not because someone wants volumes and numbers but because the souls of men depend upon whether there are

enough chaplains to provide adequate spiritual care."

NOT too long ago the very existence of the Corps of Chaplains was threatened by persistent attacks from many churches. In the early thirties, when a wave of pacifism was at its height, a leading nondenominational religious weekly advocated discontinuance of ecclesiastical endorsement of chaplains by the General Commission or any of its affiliated denominations. Many denominational publications joined in the attack. One group, The Disciples of Christ, voted to send no more chaplains to the armed forces, and requested the General Commission to sever its connection with the military chaplaincy. In 1934, several Methodist conferences requested their bishops to refrain from sending any of their members to the chaplaincy. In 1936, the Evangelical and Reformed Church refused further participation. The Methodist Episcopal Church requested the Federal Council to seek a method whereby civilian ministers might render the spiritual ministry to the armed forces.

These efforts resulted in an "attitude survey" by the Federal Council of the armed forces chaplains. They found a strong sense of vocation among the chaplains, and learned that uniform and rank were both important factors in their work.

In due time, the tide of pacifism ebbed with the coming of the shad-

ows of World War II, and the prestige of the chaplain rose again in ecclesiastical circles.

Now, the chaplaincy has the finest opportunities for service; the highest standing in the military scheme; and the best possible equipment for professional performance. But many chaplains fear that some of the churches are showing signs of reverting again to the attitude they held toward the Corps of Chaplains back in the 1930s.

Important as the chaplaincy is, however, the Chief Chaplains agree that without the full support and cooperation of the churches they cannot perform their missions. Admiral Salisbury emphasizes that the churches must bring their influence to bear on their young men and women "before they go into the service, while they are in, and when they get home again."

General Carpenter has suggested that, when an inductee leaves to go into the service, some agency of his church should be informed by his pastor. This agency of the church should be responsible for maintaining contact with the GI throughout his entire period in service. General Carpenter further suggested that the churches name a "contact" pastor from a church of the same denomination located near the military establishment where the man is stationed. The "contact" pastor could then go into the military establishment and get acquainted with the youth and take him into the life of

the church and the community. There the church could substitute its influence for that of the church at home.

THE chaplains agree that the home churches of the men in service, as well as their family and friends, should keep in communication with their servicemen while away. Admiral Salisbury said this touch with home, with associates, and with loved ones, keeps the serviceman conscious of "all those good and fine things which make him a man of character and responsibility."

Admiral Salisbury told the Second Annual Governor's Conference on

Children and Youth, at Providence, R. I., last fall, that, while it is the responsibility of the military to keep alive those vital connections with the home people, "it is the responsibility of the home folks, in the schools, churches, homes and communities, to keep in touch with their service people.

"For within a decade, military service of your young people will reach with strong influence into every institution of our national life. You must have men and women of character in your local communities in the days to come. We all need them if our nation is to survive."



» The less government we have the better — the fewer laws and the less confided power. The antidote to this abuse of formal government is the influence of private character, the growth of the individual. — *Ralph Waldo Emerson*

» Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just.
— *Thomas Jefferson*

» Life is a foreign language: all men mispronounce it.
— *Christopher Morley*

» The difference is slight, to the influence of an author, whether he is read by five hundred readers, or by five hundred thousand; if he can select the five hundred, he reaches the five hundred thousand.
— *Henry Brooks Adams*

from CINEMA *to* CINERAMA

By Milton Klonsky



THE French poet Nerval once imagined that Time, in the shape of a giant wolf, would someday pounce upon the Cathedral of Notre Dame and bear it away by the nave, its organ bellowing and its buttresses flying, to be devoured like a fat capon. Notre Dame, of course, is still standing in the center of Paris. But only a short while ago it seemed that this fate would befall, instead, our own American movie palaces — the Alhambras, Majestics, and Taj Mahals across the country. The public was getting bored. Even Hollywood believed the day was coming when all her gaudy temples would either be razed or else condemned to serve meanly as warehouses, garages and supermarkets.

The cry of "wolf," however, was premature. As everybody knows by now, a new technique called Cinerama has arrived, and the whole situation is changed. Cinerama projects an illusion of such depth, a luminous space in which images seem carved out of solid light, that the old "silver screen" is dim and

flat in comparison. The barrier between the real and the unreal, the screen itself, seems dissolved. During one scene, especially, showing a roller-coaster ride, audiences hold on to their seats as though to resist being drawn into the depths. There is a continual giggle of surprise and excitement in the theatre, oohs and ahs, and eyes interviewing other eyes for confirmation of what they have seen.

From the reaction of the first audiences, we can expect that conventional movies will seem as antiquated in a few years as the silent films of a generation past. The gap between them is just as wide. There are other tri-dimensional screen techniques now being demonstrated, but these require patrons to put on large, colored plastic goggles to achieve the stereoscopic effect. Such a bug-eyed audience, wearing these contraptions, like a swarm of science-fiction insects, will be as spectacular as anything on the screen. Cinerama, however, does the work all by itself.

The new process employs three

crisscrossing projectors, rather than one, and three screens joined and curved in an arc 146 degrees wide and 55 degrees high, in place of the standard rectangle. Since the human eyes can cover about 180 degrees from side to side and 90 degrees up at a single glance, seeing from the front as well as from the corners of the retina, this semicircular screen encompasses almost the entire field of vision. And, as Cinerama improves, the area may be extended even farther until the concave screen of the theatre and the convex dome of the eye can form a complete circle of consciousness. Of course, this is a fantastic speculation. But, even under the present setup, the illusion of reality is sometimes strong enough to suspend any disbelief, willing or unwilling, on the part of the audience. In "presence," Cinerama can be compared to the Elizabethan theatre where the gentlemen patrons sat in chairs on the stage itself, chatting among themselves and eating chicken pie and cherries, close enough to spew the bones and pits at the villain.

ACCOMPANYING the images as they move back and forth across the screen in depth, are free and moving sounds as well, escaped from their usual confinement in a single box. There are eight speakers in the Cinerama theatre, five placed behind the screen, one on each side wall, and another in the rear to reproduce the off-set noises as they approach and

leave the scene from all directions. The effect is of a stereophonic sound articulated in depth as clearly as the images themselves. Thus, the arrival of a motor boat can be heard first dimly in the rear, then somewhat louder from the side, and, as the image reaches the screen and grows larger, the sound rises with it to a roar until both sound and image fade out of the picture at the same time.

The program of Cinerama presented at the Broadway Theatre in New York was designed as a virtuosic display of the new medium. After a long preface by Lowell Thomas, tracing the history of moving pictures on an ordinary screen, the curtains were drawn back and Cinerama began, symbolically, with a headlong plunge down the chutes and around the curves of a Coney Island rollercoaster. Then followed a ballet performance in which the potentialities of the great screen — 51 feet long and 25 feet high — were cramped to fit the size of a stage; also, scenes of Venice showing the piazzas and wide vistas of the Grand Canal adequately spread out; a bullfight in Spain; a march down a field by hundreds of Scotch bagpipe players all blowing at the same time; the Triumphal Scene from Act II of *Aida* at La Scala Milan; a travelogish sequence of motor boating and water-ski acrobatics (with the bathing beauties in 3 dimensions, naturally) at Cypress Gardens in Florida. It closed with a transcontinental flight through canyons

and gorges and over the plains and mountains of the United States. The only word to describe this colossal compound of Art and Nature, this Pelleas and Melisande heaped on Ossa, is, figuratively speaking, "pellossal." But let's not be carried away.

The most effective scenes were those in which the new sights and sounds were exhibited in a natural environment. If Nijinsky had been shown making one of his fantastic leaps across the stage; Caruso in a duet with Jenny Lind; or John Barrymore in his prime reciting a soliloquy from "Hamlet" — it could not have been as impressive as the pictures of the Grand Canal and the bullfight, or the regiments of bagpipe players marching down the field with each squeal and foof of their crazy instruments heard distinctly. They appeared transformed, as though seen and heard for the first time.

IT MAY be curious to compare the program of Cinerama with one presented in 1896 at Koster & Bial's Music Hall in New York, on the site of Macy's department store, when "Thomas A. Edison's Latest Marvel — The Vitascope" was the attraction. In addition to vaudeville on the stage, there were shown pictures in motion in a gray and streaky light like the view through an unwashed window. The subjects were "Sea Waves," "The Umbrella Dance," "The Barber Shop," "The Skirt

Dance," "Burlesque Boxing," etc. — which may still be seen, perhaps, in Penny Arcades throughout America. According to the reports written at that time, the spectators stared at each other with a wild surprise. But, then or now, the program didn't really matter — for what the audience at the first movies as well as at Cinerama both came to witness was the thing itself, the latest prize from the forge of Vulcan.

Cinerama, of course, is the heir apparent of the movies; but it is also a distinctly new medium with traits and features of its own. As it develops and finds the nerve of its own style, the differences between the two media will become more apparent.

The earliest movies, shown in dimly lit tents and stores with a crude screen hung in the back, were little more than agitated dumbshows or photographic imitations of vaudeville acts and stage plays. But after a while the camera learned to move itself and to participate in the action. From this discovery emerged the great motif of *The Chase*, which is dominant in Chaplin's early comedies, Westerns, cops and robbers melodramas, etc., and which in one way or another figures in almost every kind of film. Then the rise of the star system in Hollywood, coinciding with the development of the close-up, gave those enormous and radiant faces on the screen an almost hypnotic power. Like modern demigods and god-

desses, the images of the stars today are as well known as those of Zeus, Astarte or Osiris were in pagan times. And finally — to bring the circle round — there was the advent of talking pictures in the late Twenties which enabled these dumb idols to speak with a human (sometimes all too human) voice. But sound also tempted Hollywood to revert to its Ur-days, when the flicks really flickered, by again imitating stage plays and vaudeville. Everyone has sat through movies which never move from the scene of a bed or a courtroom or even a lifeboat; and has had to endure cycles in *saeculo saeculorum* of jazz operas and musical comedies, like being trapped inside the neon tubes of a juke box.

CINERAMA will probably begin its own career by imitating the techniques of the movies. Inevitably, however, a new way of looking will find new things to look at. Just as the movies broke away from the single-set location of the play, so Cinerama has now freed itself from the framed and two-dimensional picture of the movies. Scenes can be shot not only from different angles but from various depths, the camera can move *around* and reflect the scene from as many angles and points of view as a diamond. The spectacular shots of crowds, battlefields, landscapes, etc., in "The Birth of a Nation" or "Gone With The Wind," can easily be surpassed by the great range and depth of its cameras.

Moreover, the new screen is too large to be dominated by a single image, such as the close-up. And without these close-ups of the stars, on which much of their glamour depended, the Cinerama theatre (and our eyes) will no longer be darkened or brightened by their hypnotic approaches and withdrawals. Human figures seem more familiar and life-size, less godlike, on the wide arc of Cinerama. There is such a large area to watch that the unfixed eyes of the spectator can range around at will; and the sound, issuing from various parts of the theatre, also serves to distract and unfreeze attention. Consequently, that old movie trance we all know may be considerably diminished, the charm unwound.

But the essential difference between them, perhaps, is this: While Cinerama is a spectacle, something to witness, the movies have always been a kind of communion. The hush and darkness of the movie theatre, the modulations of light on the screen like a preacher's raising and lowering of his voice, and the use of music to cover up sounds of talking, coughing, foot scraping — all are ancient ritual devices.

Darkness in churches congregates
the sight,

Devotion strays in open daring light,
as the poet Randolph observed in the seventeenth century. In such an atmosphere, the shadows of the movies flicker between the black-and-white world of positive fact and

the chrome world of fantasy, unreeling both on a single beam of light. Such matter-of-fact events shown in the newsreels as atomic bombs exploding, floods and famines in China or India, Senators speaking, etc., are somehow transformed to the same illusory plane as the double feature itself, and, conversely, the most incredible plots and scenes can be projected deadpan, with such gravity of emphasis, that the fantastic is accepted at face value.

THE movies have thus been able to influence the most intimate phases of American life — ways of love and codes of courtship, social manners and mannerisms, goals of success, standards of sexual beauty, and even the “looks” of good and evil — for millions. The love affairs of the stars among themselves and sometimes with favored mortals outside the movies, how they were made and remade, exchanged in trade,

parlayed and relayed, played, recounted years later around every American fireside, bar and soda fountain, these are already part of our national folklore.

In Cinerama, paradoxically, the illusion of reality is so great that it is accepted as such, as an illusion — and simple faith is withheld. The stars would have to adopt an almost impossible kind of acting, more stylized than the postures and grimaces of the silent films, in order to attain an equal magnitude.

And yet the potentiality of this new medium as an enlargement of experience is almost without limit. By the time the Russians invent Cinerama, we shall probably have been among the planets, at the bottom of the ocean, on top of the Himalayas, and in the boudoirs of screen beauties still unborn. On the arc of Cinerama, as it spreads, the daydreams of the second half of the twentieth century may be given a local habitation and a name.



» All works of taste must bear a price in proportion to the skill, taste, time, expense and risk attending their invention and manufacture.

Those things called dear are, when justly estimated, the cheapest: they are attended with much less profit to the Artist than those which everybody calls cheap.

Beautiful forms and compositions are not made by chance, nor can they ever, in any material, be made at small expense.

A composition for cheapness and not excellence of workmanship is the most frequent and certain cause of the rapid decay and entire destruction of arts and manufacturers. — *Josiah Wedgwood*

The "NEW" Soviet Anti-Semitism

By Victor Riesel

HIDDEN SOMEWHERE in Canada under the alert protection of the Royal Mounted Police is the Soviet code clerk, Igor Sergeievitch Gouzenko, undoubtedly unaware that he not only broke the famous Soviet spy ring, but also casually tossed off the first hint of a globe-rattling story which was not to startle the world until seven years after he turned the Russian embassy secret police files over to the Canadian authorities.

Gouzenko, who arrived in Canada two years before he and his wife and little son, Andrei, hid in a neighbor's apartment while NKVD killers ransacked his home, told the Mounted Police sometime in the course of endless questioning that as early as 1943 he had come across internal Soviet directives ordering the exclusion of Jews from certain strategic positions and their diminution in other departments.

Exactly seven years later to the day, Rudolf Slansky, Dr. Vladimir Clementis and nine other prominent Czech Communists were in a "Peoples' Court" confessing in Soviet robot fashion to "high treason"

and "admitting" they were "Zionist, Trotskyite, Titoist enemies of Stalinism." One of the defendants, Gen. Karl Svab, formerly chief of Czechoslovakia's own version of the MVD, told the five-man court that he had "protected a Jewish bourgeois-national plot." Another defendant was one Otto Katz, himself one of the original couriers linking the Canadian spies with Americans and the Mexicans who still keep open the underground route to Prague and Moscow.

A few days later, after the secret police had forced the wives and children of the accused to write to the Peoples' judges demanding the death sentences for fathers and husbands, the prisoners were hanged in Prague's grim Pankrac prison.

The Soviet Union's first public anti-Semitic trial was over.

It was Russia's loudest pronouncement to the world that it now was ready to wipe out the 2,700,000 people of Jewish faith who had found themselves behind the Iron Curtain after the war. These were the hostages which had kept Jewish leaders across the world silently or-

ganizing underground railroads over which to save as many lives as possible. For without them the Jews would indeed be wiped from the earth; a mere 8,600,000 would be left, scattered in a hundred lands.

There was no weeping anywhere for Slansky and his comrades, who long ago repudiated Hebrew culture and all religion except the cult worship of Joseph Vissaronovich Stalin. But then the Soviet propaganda agencies, a few days later, announced that they would soon try six Jewish doctors on charges of murdering two top Communist Party officials and plotting the death of Soviet military leaders. One of those accused, Dr. M. S. Vovsi, "admitted" he had "received instructions regarding the extermination of the leading cadres of the Soviet Union from the U. S. and the Joint Distribution Committee."

THAT was the open declaration of war by the Soviets on what is left of world Jewry. It was the announcement of Genocide, Inc. The attack on the Joint Distribution Committee meant that the Soviets were now as openly anti-Semitic as a Dachau gas oven, for the committee is the symbol of relief of Jewish suffering across the world.

This, then, was it.

Characteristically, but futilely, the young Jews of Israel declared war on the Soviets as they had on the British decades ago. The terror-

ist group of "Young Hebrews" swung into action.

This hitherto unknown "Young Hebrew" band plastered Tel Aviv with posters boasting they had bombed a Soviet bookshop in Jerusalem — and threatened to bomb and burn every shop selling Soviet books. Another book store displaying Soviet propaganda material was burned. Even the usually more temperate leaders of Israel's political parties demanded a Knesset (Congressional) debate on Russian anti-Jewish charges.

For there no longer was any hope that the Israelis' silence could save the 2,700,000 lives.

The Soviet government had made it plain. The fine was about to be collected on the greatest crime in the Kremlin's code — adherence to the West, friendship to America, aid to the Western democracies in the cold war, refusal of the Israelis to join in the Soviet's "peace" offensive which would give the Sovietized Chinese all of Northern Korea.

For every overt slander of the Jews, the Russian high command had a covert move which in effect told the Jewish leaders this was only the beginning. Early in the year, for example, powerful Russian transmitters began jamming British Hebrew-language broadcasts from London to Israel. This was Soviet nose-thumbing. For it served no other purpose than to drown out the BBC's half-hour daily Hebrew pro-

gram of news and comments. Few heard it in Israel. But the BBC had dared to discuss the Slansky trial. The Soviets wiped out the broadcasts as a warning that it would tolerate no interference in their anti-Jewish campaign.

THEN THE DRIVE made itself felt the world over. First the virtually unknown *Agitator's Notebook*, a Soviet Communist Party "official handbook for activists," redefined Zionism. To Stalin's agit-prop (agitation-propaganda chief), Zionism was now "a reactionary nationalist trend of the Jewish bourgeoisie" acting "as a faithful agency of American imperialism" and specializing in "carrying out espionage and subversive activities for the benefit of U. S. imperialists."

This went out to 45,000 selected party workers in the Moscow region.

The point to remember, as Soviet anti-Semitism grows more lethal in the land where the Jew is not even permitted to wander, is this section of the *Agitator's Notebook*:

"After the formation of the State of Israel in 1948, Zionists who seized power there were transforming the country into an American military base, as a stronghold of reaction in the Near East."

Then the handbook was boiled down to a world directive — and the blast against the Jews spewed forth from every Soviet Cominform section including the Communist

Party, USA. Ironically, the New York *Daily Worker* had two stories facing each other on Wednesday, January 11. One, championing the Soviet master spies recruited a decade ago, the Rosenbergs, charged that the U. S. authorities were attempting to force a "confession" out of those two, who are among the coldest, most methodical spies ever caught anywhere. Topping this story was a headline which had the word "confess" in quotes. Right opposite, on page three, was the headline telling of the arrest of the Jewish doctors in Moscow. They had confessed, shouted the headlines; but the Moscow confession was not in quotes.

THE STORY, written on orders from the "ninth floor" crowd (the Politburo), was the rawest bit of anti-Semitism in America since the German-American Bund ceased publishing its Yorkville edition of *Der Stürmer*. It is vital that part of this story be put on the record. The Communists everywhere are denying that it appeared:

On the bottom of column five, page three of the Wednesday, January 14, edition, the *Daily Worker* actually said:

"The Joint Distribution Committee was organized after World War I by a group of wealthy Jewish capitalists, including the Warburgs, Lehmans, Schiffs, Guggenheims and Baerwalds. Its direction, since its founding, was held in the hands of

this tightly knit group of Jewish members of the Wall Street finance-capitalist strata. As their financial arm purportedly established for charitable and human aims — 'Joint' was the companion organ of the American Jewish Committee.

"Among the directors of this committee are partners of the Kuhn-Loeb investment banking house; Jacob Blaustein, oil tycoon; Lewishohn and Strauss, mining magnates; Perlstein, of the Pabst Brewing fortune; and Ittleston, investment executive.

"Needless to say, both Joint and AJC (American Jewish Committee) have been handmaidens of the post-war policy of American imperialism, and major props throughout the world of the State Department's program of subversion, aggression and the organization of world war."

Not in all the years I covered the German-American Bund and professional anti-Semites have I heard more flagrant use of the Jewish capitalist theme invented by Joseph Goebbels.

IN Prague, a few days earlier, the official radio had attacked "the capitalist-owned Jewish newspapers printed in the capitalist countries." At the same time the Central Committee of the East German Communist Party launched a violent anti-Semitic attack against "agents of Zionism and capitalist Jewry." The Third-and-a-Half Reich was imitating its predecessor. The echo

of storm-troopers' boots resounded in the words of Soviet-controlled Eastern Germany.

Where had it all started?

With Lenin, of course. Back in 1903 when the little fellow teamed up with Joe Stalin to write something called "Against the Bund." Not the German Bund — the Socialist Bund of that time. And then in 1913, Stalin went anti-Semitic on his own and mocked the Jews in "Marxism and the National and Colonial Question."

And then again in the early thirties, the Communist cartoonists, wooing the Arabian world, caricatured Jews as gross humans. These were the models for Hitler's No. 1 anti-Semitic journalist, Julius Streicher — and provoked anti-Communist riots on New York's East Side.

But this was not yet the military anti-Semitism of today. That was kicked off by General Vassily I. Chuikov, now Commander in Chief of the Soviet troops in Germany.

Early in 1946, the Soviets began speeding the anti-Jewish weeding which Igor Gouzenko reported a year earlier to the Canadian police. The Soviet timetable was set for the Orient express. It may be oversimplification, but the schedule called for uniting the Oriental and Moslem world behind it. Then the Red parade through China, Korea, the underbelly lands; then the Near East, Africa, and finally hooking up with the Soviet base in Guate-

mala and a deal with Peron in Argentina.

At the same time the Russians needed a powerful German force at their back to hold off Western Germany and the victorious allies. In Germany there was only one hope for the Russian Communists — to hook onto the National Socialists, the Nazis, who originally dreamed of tying a mechanized German Reich to the vast agrarianism of Russia.

This meant the Russian Politburo would be wooing the mortal enemies of the remnants of world Jewry. To the pragmatists in the Kremlin, this, in turn, meant the Jews must be purged from all civilian, industrial, military and other strategic work. Thus would be wiped out any danger of any sentimental Jewish Stalinist turning on the regime. At the same time the Russians would be saying to the neo-Nazis and the Arab League, "See, we're your friends."

EARLY IN 1946 the purge began. Gen. Chuikov picked on the shabby appearance of Russian troops at an Army parade. Swiftly he blamed the Jews for the traditional sloppiness of the Russian soldier. His top officers were reproached for not removing all other Jewish officers.

"Jews are always a disruptive influence," he said. Purges, arrests and open persecution followed. Some were transferred to interior bases. Jewish servicemen, on demobiliza-

tion, were not permitted to return to their jobs as engineers, technicians and industrial executives. Thousands were arrested as vagrants as they searched for work and were shipped as "anti-social elements" to uranium pits and Arctic labor camps.

Since Communist Party members are entitled to special job privileges in the Soviet Union, the returning Jewish members were denounced even as far back as 1946 for "Zionist decadence manifested by seeking softer jobs." Expulsion and slave camps followed like allergies in ragweed country.

Anti-Semitism jargon became the vogue in the highest Politburo circles, as Jewish artists, writers, composers and others culturally accomplished were dropped out of the official Soviet Encyclopedia. The former Hungarian Minister, Nicolas Nyaradi, reports that, when he visited Moscow to settle some reparation problems for his government, not a single high Soviet official refrained from anti-Semitic remarks. The word "zhid," for example, is the equivalent of the horrible epithet "kike." All Soviet officials used it in referring to the Jews, Nyaradi reveals.

One day, Comrade Kaftanov, the Soviet Minister of Education, was about to introduce Nyaradi to Ilya Ehrenburg, Stalin Peace Prize winner, writer and exhibit No. 1 to prove that Jews are still tolerated. The Soviet Cabinet member said to the visiting Hungarian:

"You know, he is a *zhid*, but in spite of that he is a prominent Communist and a good Soviet patriot."

If the pathetic Ehrenburg is trusted, he is one of the few Jews still permitted any prestige, with the possible exception now of Lazar Kaganovich, a genius at heavy industry organization. The rest have been purged from all vital posts, including the powerful new Central Committee of the Communist Party, reorganized last October.

The Jews were dropped although the committee roster was jumped to 125 from the 71 members elected at the party convention in 1939. And this central committee is basically a military one.

THE POINT is that in the years between 1946 and the purge of the Moscow medics, the Jewish population and Jewish influence were heavily purged so that the job could be done in the satellites without danger of sabotage at home.

Some 400,000 Jews, including women and youngsters, were deported to Siberia from the western border as early as the summer of 1947.

There also were mass deportations of some 100,000 Jews from the biggest Hungarian cities — and the government confiscated their property for sale on the world markets to squeeze valuta (foreign exchange) out of the ghoulish operation.

As early as mid-1951 all Jews were purged from Czech government

posts. Many even then were charged with treason.

Jewish cooperatives were liquidated in Poland, where all Jews were ordered into heavy industry.

Romanian Jews were arrested and deported to the evil salt mines of Akna Slatine and a new concentration camp built especially for the anti-Semitic operation in Ruda-Banya.

Liquidation of all Jewish organizations and their press took place in Russia. Jewish newspapers and magazines disappeared. Jewish schools and welfare, fraternal and social organizations were shut down. Aside from three synagogues in Moscow, where the few foreign visitors could see them, Jewish places of worship were ripped down.

During 1949, virtually all Yiddish literary figures simply vanished — including Itzik Feffer, Peretz Markish, David Bergelson, L. Kvitko, S. Alkin and Nistor, well-known in world Jewish circles. Known and despised, that is. Even Jewish sports writers disappeared.

The Soviet press began the practice of following each Russian name of these figures by their original Jewish names in parenthesis.

A camp in which only nuns and Jewish women were imprisoned was built.

Refugee Jews were put behind barbed wire in a concentration camp in Karaganda. Jewish slave laborers were concentrated in Kazakstan and Aktibinsk.

THE American Jewish Committee, later to be attacked in the *Daily Worker* as an espionage organization, although it is made up of Americans of great standing in our nation, reported that:

"There are no Jewish communal life, schools, cultural organizations, periodicals, or Jewish institutions of any kind in the Soviet Union except for a few remaining synagogues . . . Rabbis are no longer seen at official Soviet functions, although it was a regular practice to invite representatives of all ethnic groups and to encourage the clergy, both Christian and Moslem, to attend in clerical garb. A new Committee for the Defense of Peace, formed in the summer of 1951, included representatives of the Orthodox, Armenian and Lutheran churches and of the Moslem religious community, but no representatives of the Jews.

"There were assaults on individual Jews even in Moscow and Odessa. Soviet officials were indifferent to Jewish complaints and took no effective steps to curb anti-Semitic incidents . . . There are virtually no Jews remaining in the higher echelons of party and state officialdom. Only in the Soviet Republics of Central Asia are there still Jews among the secretaries of regional and local party committees."

Instead of subduing the spreading violence and pogroms, the Soviet agit-prop chief ordered the publicizing of the Ukrainian leader, Bohden Chmielnicki, as "a great statesman

and military leader." Chmielnicki was the instigator of a series of bloody pogroms during which tens of thousands of Jews were slaughtered.

Thousands of Jews are being jailed, deported, or executed each week. And the charges cover every conceivable crime, according to special studies made recently. Treason, espionage, sabotage, embezzlement of national property, deliberate starving of the population, torture of co-prisoners in Nazi concentration camps, betrayal of comrades to the Gestapo, a series of vile murders, all were supposed to have been committed by Jews, and the Slansky combine. And directed from New York and Jerusalem, says the MVD.

Jewish defendants are forced to confess they were responsible for food rationing, lack of bread, failure of electric power, low wages, high prices, and for the failure of government plans — *all* plans!

WHY THIS meticulous and methodical anti-Semitism at this very moment? Why, when the cold, emotionless men of the Kremlin know it will lose them the last vestige of support of the popular front addicts across the world? Why this gamble on internationally publicized anti-Semitism?

It can only mean that the Russians are moving towards new military adventures in a new part of the world — perhaps the adventure which will start World War III.

Where is the next parallel to Korea?

The answer to some observers came in a Yiddish-language broadcast from Bucharest to Israel, Dec. 9, 1952. Note it well:

"It is known that the biggest military airfield being built by the U. S. behind its own frontiers is in the Natanyah region in Israel," the Soviet broadcaster rasped.

"Together with the Lydda airport, it is destined to become a base of aggression in the war being prepared by the U. S. ruling circles against the camp of socialism. Today, ruling circles in the U. S. have an especially great interest in Israel. Her soil and the Dead Sea region abound in oil and other resources. Her strategic position, close as she is to the frontiers of the Soviet Union, plays an important part in the aggressive plans of the Yankees.

"Indeed, although Israel is about 15,000 kilometers removed from the U. S., the U. S. ruling circles have stated that Israel is included in the American strategic defense zone. The Ben Gurion government has no other concern than to satisfy its Washington masters. It has converted the country into an American colony which is ruled by McDaniel [*sic*] along the lines laid down by Yankee business interests. Under the dictate of its masters, the Israeli government is adjusting the country's whole economy to war preparations."

Those who have observed Soviet

strategy closely know that the Kremlin first accuses its enemies of some policy, or adventure, or plot — and then does exactly what it charged its opponent would do.

REREADING that broadcast can bring only one conclusion — the Soviets intend to move in the Near East soon.

Any move against Israel can be coupled with the Soviets' wooing of Hitler's old forces in East Germany. This, too, has long been planned. For years now the U. S. has been accused of working with Nazi forces. For years now subtle undercover agents and men accused before Congress of being Soviet operatives have pushed a propaganda campaign to prove that we plan to rebuild a Nazi Reich. But, as far back as 1948, the Soviet technique of accuse and move was working in this sector.

In May 1948, the Soviet military administration in Germany ordered the creation of the National Democratic Party. In October 1948, so it could win new members, the party was permitted to introduce a law, adopted by the Sovietized German government, ending de-Nazification and readmitting Nazis to public life. Big Russian money was dumped into the party, which makes no subtlety of its appeal to Hitler's old storm troops. It is now loaded with the old National Socialist leaders. Deputy Party Chairman is former Wehrmacht Lt. General Vincenz Mueller. Political director is Hein-

rich Homann, who has a long SS record. C. A. Brauns, former Nazi Party member, is the party's treasurer. Former Hitler Youth Leader Max Schneider is NDP chairman in Berlin. The list rolls on. Adolph would have been proud of his boys.

Furthermore, three divisions of a new East German Army, a Communist Army, now are fully equipped with artillery and tanks. Its men would never have taken orders from a government whose propaganda chief, for example, was Gerhart Eisler. So he has been purged.

And apparently he is only part of the final round-up.

Those old inner-party directives Igor Gouzenko talked of, but never for a moment thought were as explosive as the secrets of the weapon which the Canadian spy ring stole, may yet lead to a greater upheaval than that of the spy ring he exposed — and the many rings he knew existed but which were kept secret from him.

Soviet anti-Semitism may be the signal for the "final conflict" the Reds sing about so much.

» Things cannot always go your way. Learn to accept in silence the minor aggravations, cultivate the gift of taciturnity and consume your own smoke with an extra draught of hard work, so that those about you may not be annoyed with the dust and soot of your complaints. — *Sir William Osler*

» No government is respectable which is not just. Without unspotted purity of public faith, without sacred public principle, fidelity, and honor, no mere forms of government, no machinery of laws, can give dignity to political society. — *Daniel Webster*

» What gunpowder did for the war, the printing-press has done for the mind; the statesman is no longer clad in the steel of special education, but every reading man is his judge. — *Wendell Phillips*

» As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy. — *Abraham Lincoln*

A Last Visit With Santayana

By Wilbert Snow

THE
COLUMBUS
SONNET

*O world, thou choosest not the better part!
It is not wisdom to be only wise,
And on the inward vision close the eyes,
But it is wisdom to believe the heart.
Columbus found a world, and had no chart,
Save one that faith deciphered in the skies;
To trust the soul's invincible surmise
Was all his science and his only art.
Our knowledge is a torch of smoky pine
That lights the pathway but one step ahead
Across a void of mystery and dread.
Bid, then, the tender light of faith to shine
By which alone the mortal heart is led
Unto the thinking of the thought divine.*

. . . SANTAYANA

ON November 20th of last year I visited and talked with George Santayana. He was living on the outskirts of Rome at a hospital conducted by the Blue Sisters of the Little Company of Mary at 6 Via Santo Stefano Rotondo. Years ago, as a young instructor at Williams College, I had known him and walked the Berkshire Hills in his company. Hence I was one of the

lucky ones who penetrated his outer defenses in Rome.

He was sitting in a comfortable lounging chair, clothed in pajamas and an old, blue, somewhat faded dressing gown. He did not rise, but greeted me with a friendly smile. I noted at once that despite his apparent frailty, his brown eyes had not lost their magnificent luster. His frame was thinner, much thinner

than in 1910; for at that time he had the appearance of a clean-cut, intelligent, well-fed monk. He looked then strikingly like our own Wallace Stevens. I found him this time to be slightly deaf, but he told me he could hear every word I said.

We talked about poetry, for it was as a poet that I admired him in my youth. I told him how much I admired his "Columbus" sonnet, and how often I had pointed out its virtues to my classes in Modern Poetry. He said it was the first poem he ever wrote, although he had always placed it third in his published works. He told me how the sonnet originated. He was studying the Greek classics at Harvard under Professor Louis Dyer.

One day while they were reading "The Bacchae" of Euripides they came upon the lines which read, in translation: "How unwise are the wise." Or as Gilbert Murray translates it: "But the world's wise are not wise."

Santayana continued: "This line set me on fire, and around this line I built my 'Columbus' sonnet."

I spoke of his "Minuet at Fifty." He said, "I will let you in on a little secret. I wrote that poem when I was sixty. I felt that the emotions expressed in the poem were more fitting to a man of fifty than to one of sixty; hence the title." He chuckled at the memory, and said that people who came to see him rarely mentioned his poetry. They all wanted to talk politics or philos-

ophy. I saw that he was glad to talk poetry for a change. I had been teaching his sonnets in my Modern Poetry course for years, and could quote many of them by heart.

He once wrote in a preface to a volume of his poetry, "I think the discerning reader will probably prefer the later prose versions of my philosophy; I prefer them myself. . . . Yet, if he is curious in the matter, he may find the same thing here nearer to its fountainhead, in its accidental early setting, and *with its most authentic personal note.*" (The italics are mine.)

I veered the conversation toward his Spanish poems, and quoted from "Spain in America":

"Not all these treasons blotted her
renown
Emblazoned higher than such
hands can reach:
There where she reaped but sorrow
she has sown
The balm of sorrow; all she had to
teach
She taught the younger world —
her faith and heart and speech."

I could see that these lines moved him, for he straightened up in his chair and said: "I shouldn't be here. I am a Spaniard, and should be spending my latter days in Spain." He said "I'm a Spaniard" with such forcefulness that he seemed stirred to the very roots. I asked, "Why aren't you in Spain?" He shook his head and answered, "The government is too rotten; politics, too

corrupt." I suggested that conditions were not perfect in Italy. He said, "No, but they are much better here."

I HAD silently resolved not to speak about his book, "Dominations and Powers." I felt it was too anti-democratic, that the old Spanish intellectual aristocrat in him was at the heart of this miscellaneous collection of essays. But I told him gently that, while I deplored the Franco regime and all it stood for, I would have felt happier if his own book on government had not been so harsh on our American democracy. He said, "Look again. I left the American question open."

As soon as I could get to a library I reread more carefully his summing up of the United States. "It is only now," he concludes in his book, "that the multiplication of mechanisms has become a nightmare, omnipresent advertisements a plague, the overgrown proletariat a quicksand beneath the feet of wealth [note the old Spanish aristocrat in those ten words!] and the hierarchy of occupations a reversion to a sort of serfdom. In Europe this tragedy of commercialism is perceived; in America it seems to rumble still invisible below the horizon. And it may be a serious question whether a universal government in American hands would not attempt to revitalize the commercial optimism of the nineteenth century, by the aid of new inventions and better

coordination of resources. Or would it face the inevitable limit to industrial expansion and establish a stable economic order in a world where labor might again merge with self-rewarding arts, and imagination turn from devising machines to cultivating liberal arts and enlarging moral freedom?" Thus he was right; he did leave America with a challenge and a question mark. He was in our country long enough to absorb the American dream.

I could see that my political talk was tiring him. I wished I had kept to my initial resolve, for his poetry was much more congenial to me than his politics. So back to poetry we went.

HE THOUGHT the poets of the 90's were on the whole a disappointing lot. He knew Lionel Johnson, and had heard him "pontificate" at Oxford. "A frail sort of man," Santayana said, "but with a somewhat brilliant mind." I protested that Johnson's poetry was largely rhetoric, that even the "Charles First" poem had a certain rhetorical ring of insincerity. He didn't like, he said, my cavalier disdain of rhetoric. "All poetry is rhetoric in a way," he countered. But on the whole he agreed with my estimate. He said that Johnson was a great friend of Bertrand Russell, and that it was Russell who had sent him to call on Johnson.

The last poet we talked about was Ezra Pound, and the mercurial Ezra

won't like it if I record here what the philosopher said about him. But here goes. Santayana said that he and Ezra had known about each other for a long time, for at least 20 years, but that Pound did not come to call on him in Rome until he was "in a jam." Pound had spent many hours plugging for Mussolini and the corporate state. He finally became a hired agent of the Fascists. Apparently running out of material for his international broadcasts, and needing some fundamental anti-democratic ideas to buttress his world-wide radio attacks on American democracy, Pound came to see Santayana.

The latter remarked of Pound in our interview: "He apparently thought of me as a source of material against the whole democratic movement!" He said this in a wry manner, as much as to say that he hated to be labeled for or against any "ism." The picture of Ezra seeking him out for anti-democratic propaganda material fascinated me. I told him that Ezra, who had reviled America, persecuted her, and had said all manner of evil against her, was now enjoying American hospitality, and that this generous magnanimity on the part of our country was to me a grand gesture, a national Prodigal Son manifestation. He laughed at this and said, "America is always amusing."

During this visit Ezra told Santayana about his poetic work. "He said he wanted to make a hundred

cantos, as Dante did in the 'Comedia,' and he wanted to have a Great Rose Window at the end, as Dante did." But Dante, Santayana continued, "knew Catholic theology and Pound does not." Eliot, he said, "knows Catholic theology much better than Pound." I then suggested that Pound was more the scholar than the poet. "No," he said, "Pound is not a good scholar; he merely uses what scholarship he has to bolster up his poetry. He is more poet than anything else."

WE TALKED about his widely read novel, "The Last Puritan." I insisted that his New Englander had a Spanish mentality, and that he was a bit severe on America. He said he was surprised by the success of the book, but that Americans had a tendency to buy novels that were severe on them. "A good trait," he thought. I told him that the parts of the book I liked were his observations on fundamental matters such as his apostrophe to Oxford, quoting: "What these low walls shut out was not the great universe. It was only a waste land of desolation and folly. Outside, not within, lay the real hopelessness. Within was an orchard of perennial fruits. These great trees carried the murmur of earthly labor almost to the clouds, almost to the veiled courses of the stars." I garbled this paragraph in my attempt to say it from memory, but he did not mind; he had forgotten the entire passage.

I liked what he had written about his mother in his autobiography and said that she must have been a wonderful woman. From a sheltered, refined, cultured environment, she made herself into a successful merchant in the Philippines. "Indeed she was remarkable," he mused half aloud. "She lost her first child," he said, "and this cast a blight over her life. She resolved, after that, not to get too close to her other children, and held them off. When I came along, the first child by her second husband, she gave me some of the tenderness that she had wanted to give to the lost child. In that way I was favored." He said all this more as if he were talking to the room than to me.

ALL AT ONCE Santayana began talking of his friends. In this group Bentley Warren apparently held first place. Warren was a trustee of Williams College and the one man I had to call upon at the time that I was seeking my appointment there.

Santayana spoke in the highest terms of William James. "He did not agree with me," he said, "but he had a large outlook on life and was far more generous in his judgments than most men. And he had gusto, a quality that I was not endowed with."

As I walked back to my hotel, I thought about this last remark and decided that it was not exactly true. For a man living apart, Santayana

took a lively interest in the world. But his interest was like that of a visitor from another planet who felt that life on this earth was a "great disaster," but that in the midst of this disaster we could be "happy and forget our doom." He must have experienced a great love. In one sonnet he says, "One love suffices an eternity." But I surmise that he also had some catastrophic love experience, for in a brilliant passage on the "Comedia" he pictures Paolo and Francesca as doomed by God to be linked together throughout a long eternity. Surely Dante did not intend that devastating interpretation when he wrote the fifth canto of the "Inferno." This was merely the expression of a perverse element in Santayana.

The press reported that he refused to accept the last rites of the Catholic Church. This made me feel a little sad for the nuns, for they labored earnestly for his salvation. But he did want to be buried in the neutral section of the Spanish Catholic burying ground in Rome. How much that wish tells about his life and thought! He retained a profound love for the Catholic Church. Its pageantry, its history, its music, its art, its political leadership in the Middle Ages, its monuments of architecture such as Peter's Dome and Chartres Cathedral — all these had for him an endless fascination. All these made other churches seem to him a bit amateurish.

But he could not bring himself to

accept the creed and dogma of Catholicism. The Boston Latin School, Harvard University, the New England thinkers of the Concord School, the men who brought our Protestant agricultural civilization to its flowering were, I am entirely convinced, responsible for this dualism in the man. New

England Puritanism, like New England oaks, strikes deep roots, and Santayana could not free himself altogether from this early heritage. We know too well that "we shall not look upon his like again." To many of us he represents more fully than anyone else the flowering of 19th century European civilization.



» The sublime and the ridiculous are often so nearly related, that it is difficult to class them separately. One step above the sublime makes the ridiculous, and one step above the ridiculous makes the sublime again. — *Thomas Paine*

» Every man's work, whether it be literature or music or pictures or architecture or anything else, is always a portrait of himself, and the more he tries to conceal himself the more clearly will his character appear in spite of him. — *Samuel Butler*

» Scilurus on his death-bed, being about to leave four-score sons surviving, offered a bundle of darts to each of them, and bade them break them. When all refused, drawing out one by one, he easily broke them, — thus teaching them that if they held together, they would continue strong; but if they fell out and were divided, they would become weak. — *Plutarch*

» It is almost a definition of a gentleman to say he is one who never inflicts pain. . . . If he be an unbeliever, he will be too profound and large-minded to ridicule religion or to act against it; he is too wise to be a dogmatist or fanatic in his infidelity. He respects piety and devotion; he even supports institutions as venerable, beautiful, or useful, to which he does not assent; he honours the ministers of religion, and it contents him to decline its mysteries without assailing or denouncing them. — *John Henry Cardinal Newman*

◀ [*By J. B. Matthews*] ▶

Civil Liberties Upside Down

WITH a virtual monopoly on the public discussion of civil liberties in the United States, the totalitarian liberals have succeeded in introducing complete confusion into the subject, if not enveloping it in total darkness.

A totalitarian liberal is one of that schizophrenic human breed of the mid-century who is vocally shrill, if not hysterical, about liberalism, but whose political practice is as totalitarian as was Mussolini's.

In the matter of civil liberties, the totalitarian liberal seeks, on the one hand, the immunity of Communists from exposure and prosecution for their subversive activities, and, on the other hand, the enactment of fascist-like statutes for the protection of minorities against discrimination and prejudice. Neither of these objectives has anything to do with civil liberties other than aiding in their abrogation.

The result of the ceaseless agitation of these totalitarians on the subject of civil liberties is a gross distortion which leaves the basic issues out of all consideration. If any meaningful content is to be reintroduced into the subject, it will have

to be accomplished at great educational pains by the libertarians who honor the Constitution of the United States and its principles, not by the totalitarian liberals who reject the Constitution as an outmoded instrument of the late eighteenth century.

The schizophrenics were in control of the federal government during the past twenty years of two Democratic administrations. More civil liberties were lost during those years than are likely to be regained in several generations, if ever. For the left-wing or Americans-for-Democratic-Action branch of the Democratic Party to profess an interest in strengthening civil liberties is a study in hypocrisy for which a parallel would be hard to find. It is as though Murder, Inc., should come out in support of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

Prominently associated with the public discussion of civil liberties have been the Civil Rights Congress, the Senate Civil Liberties Committee (popularly known as the La-Follette Committee), the President's Committee on Civil Rights, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

These have practically monopolized the subject in recent years.

Civil Rights Congress

THE Civil Rights Congress is an agency of the Communist Party, labelled as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States. Its sole activity has been the legal defense of Communist Party leaders who have been prosecuted for conspiring to overthrow the government by force and violence, for espionage, and for treason.

The Civil Rights Congress was organized in 1946 by a merger of two other Communist groups, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, both of which have been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

The Civil Rights Congress may be dismissed with the observation that the only interest of Communists in civil liberties is one of clinging desperately to every revolutionary and conspiratorial opportunity, ultimately to destroy all civil liberties after the now familiar Soviet pattern.

It should be noted, however, that the Civil Rights Congress, in its personnel and supporters and those of its Communist predecessors, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, has been interlocked with the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, the President's Committee

on Civil Rights, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

The Senate Civil Liberties Committee

IN THE Second Session of the 74th Congress, on June 6, 1936, Senate Resolution 266 was adopted. It read in part as follows:

RESOLVED, That the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized and directed to make an investigation of violations of the rights of free speech and assembly and undue interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively.

Intermittently, during the succeeding four years, supplementary Senate resolutions were adopted which authorized additional appropriations for the committee's work. The committee came to be known as the LaFollette Committee, or the Senate Civil Liberties Committee. Its chairman was Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., of Wisconsin, and its other most active member was Senator Elbert D. Thomas of Utah.

Buried away in the files of a government agency in Washington, where it will probably remain permanently, is a report which gives the origin of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, which for four years regaled the country with lurid accounts of the alleged misdeeds of American business and businessmen.

According to this unpublished government report, a group of Communists met one evening at the

home of a well-known Communist in Carmel, California. Before the meeting broke up that night (early in the days of the Wagner Labor Relations Act), it had been decided to approach certain United States Senators with a plan for setting up a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor for the alleged purpose of investigating civil liberties and especially the right of labor unions to organize and bargain collectively. Actually, the objective of the Carmel Communists was an all-out smear campaign against American businessmen. How well they succeeded, the record will show.

IT WAS a fantastic plan, but the Communists correctly assessed the possibilities of the Washington of 1936. For years, they had shrieked their hatred of American business in the Communist Party's own pamphlets, magazines, and newspapers. For the greater part, however, their ravings had been ignored by the American people, who were hardly aware of the existence of the Communist Party press. Now, according to the Carmel plot, these Communists whose pre-New Deal years had been leaner than Job's turkey, would, in the name of a Senate investigation of civil liberties, utilize the legitimate press of the entire country to spread their lies and distortions.

The Carmel Communists knew their Washington of 1936 very well, indeed. Their comrades in the Wash-

ington underground had played leading parts in the Nye Committee's investigation of the munitions industry, and had gone far toward implanting in public opinion the idea that American munitions manufacturers were responsible for modern war, involving the United States in the First World War. (They little reckoned that the efficiency of these American munitions manufacturers would one day save their Soviet "fatherland" from destruction.)

Alger Hiss had been attached to the staff of the Nye Committee after he became a member of the Communist underground espionage ring in Washington. If Soviet agents like Hiss could get berths on an important Senate Committee, why not some of the other members of the now notorious Harold Ware cell on the committee of the Senate which the Carmel Communists proposed? At any rate, that's the way it happened. John Abt and Charles Krivitsky, alias Kramer, played leading roles in the LaFollette civil liberties investigation once it got under way on June 6, 1936. Both Abt and Krivitsky have been positively identified as members of the Harold Ware espionage ring while they were working for Senators Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., and Elbert D. Thomas in the smearing of American business leaders.

WITH Soviet agents like Abt and Krivitsky on the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee staff, it

followed as a matter of course that scores of known Communists and Communist stooges were paraded as witnesses before the committee during the four years of its existence.

These LaFollette Committee witnesses included such outstanding Communists as James Matles, John Steuben, George Addes, Alex Balint, Harry Bridges, Robert Burke, Philip M. Connelly, Ralph Dawson, Vincent Favorito, Joseph S. Gelders, Alfred Hirsch, Joe Weber, and Charles Doyle. These are just a few of the well-known Communists who spread upon the LaFollette record (79 substantial volumes plus numerous reports) their lies and distortions about American business enterprise, all in the name of investigating civil liberties.

Altogether, more than 150 Communists and Communist stooges testified or gave affidavits for the LaFollette Committee. Their Communist records were readily available to Senators LaFollette and Thomas, but the latter resolutely declined to delve into the political and ideological connections of their aggregation of Communist witnesses.

In 1946, Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., was retired from the Senate by the voters of Wisconsin. In 1950, the voters of Utah did the same to Elbert D. Thomas. After his defeat for re-election LaFollette wrote an article for *Collier's* entitled "Turn the Light on Communism." The ex-Senator came dangerously close to blurting out the whole truth, but he

restrained himself. The light he turned on the Communist aspect of his Senate Civil Liberties Committee was only a momentary flicker. "I know from first-hand experience," he wrote, "that Communist sympathizers have infiltrated into committee staffs on Capitol Hill in Washington. . . . A few years ago, when I was chairman of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, I was forced to take measures in an effort to stamp out influences within my own committee staff." As far as the ex-Senator's statement goes, it is quite an admission even though it came ten years after the events, when it did not matter very much. John Abt, his general counsel, was, as has been pointed out, much more than a Communist sympathizer. One is forced, also, to conclude that LaFollette failed miserably in his alleged "effort to stamp out influences."

It may come as a revelation to ex-Senator LaFollette to learn that important activities of his and of ex-Senator Nye's Senate committees were manipulated by the hidden hand of one of the most sinister Soviet agents in the entire history of the international Communist movement, namely, Louis Gibarti.

Among other things, Gibarti was assigned the job of smearing anti-Communist journalists like George Sokolsky, and he found the LaFollette and Nye committees convenient tools for this assignment of the Kremlin. In the intervening years,

Gibarti has broken with his Communist masters. When he comes forward, according to present plans, to tell his story of Communist intrigue, espionage, and treason in the United States, his name will become as familiar to the public as that of Whittaker Chambers.

It is hardly possible that any more cynical performance than that of the LaFollette-Thomas Committee of the United States Senate will ever be perpetrated in the name of investigating civil liberties.

The President's Committee on Civil Rights

THE President's Committee on Civil Rights was created by executive order on December 5, 1946. Charles E. Wilson, then head of General Electric Company, was named chairman. Almost a year later, the committee released its 72,000-word report to the public in a volume entitled *To Secure These Rights*, printed, of course, at the taxpayer's expense as was the case with all the millions of dollars' worth of New Deal-Fair Deal propaganda. The appearance of the report did not create even a ripple of protest, so deadened had the sensibilities of the American people become to the destruction of their constitutional liberties.

The report of the President's Committee was significant, partly for its glaring omissions which resulted in the typical left-wing distortions of the issue of civil liberties.

The committee wore blinkers as it made its way through the shambles which fifteen years of the New Deal had made of basic civil liberties. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., was one of the fifteen members of the President's Committee. It was hardly to be expected that the son would view the destructive record of his father, in the matter of constitutional liberties, with anything approaching objectivity. Most of the other members of the committee were spiritual kinsmen of the late President and were, therefore, equally incapable of objectivity.

A singular fact about the President's Committee is that half of its members had records of collaboration with Communist enterprises. The records of James B. Carey, Frank Porter Graham, and Channing H. Tobias were particularly glaring in this respect. Carey, secretary of the CIO, would undoubtedly be pleased if the public would forget all about his long and intimate activity with Communists. The Communist-front record of Graham, which may well qualify him for his present United Nations job, was a major factor in his defeat for election as a United States Senator from North Carolina in 1950. Despite his even longer and more serious record of collaboration with Communists, and solely because he is a Negro, Channing Tobias was confirmed as an appointee to the United Nations. Morris L. Ernst, another member of the President's Committee, has re-

cently distinguished himself by labelling as "squealers" all the ex-Communists who have served their country by exposing the Kremlin's conspiracy against the United States.

AN HISTORICAL footnote on the origin of the President's Committee is revealing. In a press release dated September 20, 1951, Walter White, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, claimed for his organization the full credit for starting the process which resulted in the President's Committee on Civil Rights.

White said: "The committee was the result of a meeting during the bloody, violence-ridden summer of 1946 when 43 non-Communist national organizations met at the invitation of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People . . ."

Walter White further claimed the leading role for himself in persuading Truman to order the creation of the committee. In this connection, he asserted: "It was the unanimous conviction of the conferees that democracy can be preserved only by practicing democracy. . . . That was the argument a committee appointed by the conference presented to President Truman which in turn led to his naming the committee. I know because I was named spokesman for the committee and served in that capacity."

Thus, according to Walter White's

press release, he and the NAACP were the prime movers in bringing about the appointment of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. In the light of this claim, it is relevant to call attention to the records of White and the NAACP. His claim that he and Channing Tobias and the NAACP are and *always have been* anti-Communist is fantastic, but strictly in line with the common practice of glossing over one's past. The documentary record belies his claim.

It should, however, be made clear that there is no allegation here, expressed or implied, that Walter White and Channing H. Tobias are Communists or that the NAACP is a Communist front.

With reference to Walter White, the specific allegation is that he has been affiliated in one way or another with at least ten Communist fronts. With reference to Channing H. Tobias, the specific allegation is that he has been affiliated with more than a score of Communist fronts. With reference to the NAACP, the specific allegation is that the organization has been infiltrated by Communists and fellow travelers at high levels of its structure. It cannot, therefore, in the nature of things, have been always and effectively anti-Communist. To cite a single example, Earl B. Dickerson, Negro attorney of Chicago, who is a key figure in the NAACP, has one of the most glaring pro-Communist records in the country.

The appointments to the President's Committee on Civil Rights were handled by a mysterious and highly questionable character in the White House, the late David K. Niles.

The key position of general counsel to the President's Committee was held by Nancy Wechsler, wife of the New York *Post's* editor. Both of the Wechslers were at one time members of the Young Communist League. The whole slant of the New York *Post*, under James Wechsler's editorship, has been notoriously anti-anti-Communist and, therefore, of aid and comfort to the Communist conspiracy. Furthermore, Nancy Wechsler is the daughter of one Osmond K. Fraenkel, long an attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union and a veteran collaborator with Communist causes.

The foregoing facts make it easier to understand how important items of the Communist Party line were smuggled into the report of the President's Committee.

THE Communists, on their part, greeted the report with enthusiasm. The Workers' Bookshop of the Communist Party in New York featured it in a window display as soon as it was off the press. The significance of this can hardly be exaggerated. The Communist Party's book store simply does not display in this fashion any book which it considers at all hostile to the interests of Communism.

Another piece of evidence of the Communists' approval of the report concerned the Hollywood Communists. On Sunday, November 2, 1947, five radio broadcasts, three of which were network programs, made rabble-rousing defenses of the Hollywood Communists, ten of whom eventually went to prison. These radio programs, all of them, picked up and broadcast two sentences from the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. These two sentences read as follows: "Specifically, public excitement about 'Communists' has gone far beyond the dictates of the 'good judgment' and 'calmness' of which Holmes and Brandeis spoke. A state of near-hysteria now threatens to inhibit the freedom of genuine democrats." These sentences were, of course, wholly false. They bore no relationship to any facts of the national psychology, but they were promptly picked up as propaganda weapons by the Communists and used by them to prove that all exposures of Communists and fellow travelers are acts of hysteria.

The Communist press hailed the report with undisguised satisfaction. The Communist Party's own *Chicago Star* and the Communist-controlled *Hotel and Club Voice* (since cleansed of its subversive managers) are two examples of this favorable reception.

It is quite true that the report of the President's Committee did not give the Communists a whole loaf,

but it is well known that the Kremlin's conspirators welcome a half loaf when they cannot get a whole loaf, and a half is what they got in the report of the President's Committee.

The report has all the blind spots of the typical totalitarian liberals.

The committee made a perfectly proper and correct observation when it said: "Where the threat of violence by private persons or mobs exists, a cruel inhibition of the sense of freedom of activity and security of the person inevitably results. Where a society permits private and arbitrary violence to be done to its members, its own integrity is inevitably corrupted." So far, so good; but nowhere in the 72,000 words of its reports did the committee have the intellectual integrity to point out that mob violence, including not only mayhem but murder, has been winked at, if not deliberately encouraged, by totalitarian liberals when done at the behest of labor union bosses. Vast labor empires which set themselves above all government were founded on mob violence and the destruction of civil liberties, with the encouragement of New Deal politicians and totalitarian liberals during the Roosevelt-Truman era. By ignoring this fact of the past twenty years, the members of the President's Committee on Civil Rights demonstrated that they had as little interest in the preservation of civil rights as they had in saving the American buffalo or the Tasmanian wolf from extinction.

THE President's Committee not only demonstrated a lack of interest in *preserving* civil rights; it also displayed a positive interest in the abrogation of long established civil rights.

Under the section entitled "A Program of Action," the committee recommended the enactment of a compulsory federal Fair Employment Practice Act, a measure as fascistic as any ever conjured up by Benito Mussolini and one which would abrogate at a single stroke the civil liberties of millions of American citizens.

On this subject, the committee's report says: "A federal Fair Employment Practice Act prohibiting discrimination in private employment should provide both educational machinery and legal sanctions for enforcement purposes. The administration of the act should be placed in the hands of a commission with power to receive complaints, hold hearings, issue cease-and-desist orders, and seek court aid in enforcing these orders. The act should contain definite fines for the violation of its procedural provisions."

Wholly repugnant as racial and religious discrimination is, only twisted minds indifferent to freedom of contract and freedom of association could conceive of statutory compulsion as its cure. Thought-probing and thought-control by an administrative commission would be inherent in the enforcement of such a statute. The enactment of the

committee's proposed legislation would signify the transition from present-day statism to the outright slave state of Communism-Fascism.

In two important respects, the President's Committee on Civil Rights placed itself on the side of those who have already rescinded or who would rescind vital constitutional guarantees of civil liberty.

The first of these has to do with the reserved powers of the forty-eight separate republics which comprise the Union. The authors of the Constitution, notably Madison and Hamilton, believed that the reserved powers, rights, and liberties of the states were secure against federal invasion, and they so assured the doubting states prior to their ratification of the Constitution. Despite their profound wisdom in matters pertaining to government, they did not foresee the possibilities of Rooseveltian chicanery and subterfuge in undermining the sovereignty of the states in local affairs. "State governments will, in all possible contingencies," Hamilton declared, "offer complete security against invasions of the public liberty by the national authority." It was Hamilton's belief that not a single state would have ratified the Constitution if his assurance had not amounted to a certainty.

Hamilton further declared: "The plan of the [Constitutional] Convention declares that the power of Congress, or, in other words, of the *National Legislature*, shall extend to

certain enumerated cases. The specification of particulars evidently excluded all pretension to a general legislative authority, because an affirmative grant of special powers would be absurd, as well as useless, if a general authority was intended."

Nevertheless, and notwithstanding the clear intent of the authors of the Constitution, Congress has repeatedly, and especially during the past twenty years, invaded the liberty of the states, cloaking its unconstitutional usurpations with the General Welfare Clause and the Commerce Clause.

All of this undermining of the sovereignty of the states in local affairs not only received the emphatic approval of the President's Committee, but the process of federal invasion would be extended indefinitely by the committee's proposals until the complete obliteration of state sovereignty had been achieved.

IN YET another important respect, the President's Committee placed itself on the side of those who would, if given a chance, rescind vital constitutional guarantees of liberty.

The committee made the following, not too subtle, suggestion: "The Human Rights Commission of the United Nations is at present working on a detailed international bill of rights designed to give more specific meaning to the general principle announced in Article 55 of the Charter.

If this document is accepted by the United States as a member state, an even stronger basis for congressional action under the treaty power may be established."

The bald, unadorned significance of this suggestion by the President's Committee is that what Congress cannot do directly under the limitations of its constitutionally delegated powers, it may be able to do obliquely under the authority of a Human Rights Treaty, which, if ratified by the Senate, would become the supreme law of the land, taking precedence over any and all conflicting state or federal statutes. It is a gain for the whole country to have had the President's Committee on Civil Rights make itself so clear on so many points, regardless of the condemnation which the committee has invited upon itself.

Federal Labor-Management Legislation

THE federal usurpation of power has been bolstered by an interpretation of the Commerce Clause of the Constitution so broad as to cover practically all commerce. The qualifying phrase, "among the several states," has been rendered meaningless by this broad congressional and judicial interpretation.

The bureaucrats operating in the field of federal administrative law have held that a business concern is engaged in interstate commerce if any portion of its raw materials originates outside the state in which

the business is located or if any of the finished product of the business finds its way across a state boundary. A country newspaper, for example, may be held to be engaged in interstate commerce if, as is usually the case, its newsprint comes from outside the state, or, as is almost certainly the case, persons in other states subscribe to the periodical.

If the framers of the Constitution had intended that power to regulate all commerce be delegated to Congress, they would not have added the qualifying, limiting, and restrictive phrase, "among the several states."

The Wagner Labor Relations Act, which was a deadly assault upon the civil liberties of millions of citizens, was based upon this insufferable stretching of the Constitution's Commerce Clause. The Taft-Hartley Labor-Management Relations Act is equally violative of constitutional intent, but not so violently partisan in operation. If labor-management relations are the proper subject of legislation anywhere, it must be at the state level. The Constitution will be searched in vain for any delegation of powers on this subject to the Congress of the United States.

The limitations of power imposed by the Constitution upon the federal government were not written simply to be relaxed whenever some special-interest group or assorted sentimentalists desire. These limitations were conceived for the protection of the

prerogatives and liberties of the states and the citizens thereof against invasion by a power-maddened central government, the evils of which were well known to the members of the Constitutional Convention. The progressive corrosion of state and individual liberties by crafty men in the three branches of the federal government has greatly altered the basic character of American political institutions. The alteration has not served the cause of civil liberties.

Socialism and Civil Liberties

EVERY extension of socialism means an infringement of the civil liberties of the citizen. Socialism is just another word for statism. Complete socialism is collectivist slavery.

Once it was apparent that the New Deal itself was a form of socialism, Socialists in droves left the rapidly disintegrating party of Norman Thomas and went over to the New Deal party, where they became a dominant force.

The New Deal party forced the Constitution to lie down in its Procrustean bed of socialism, stretching its meaning beyond all recognition.

The spread of socialism under the New Deal was an effect which had its identifiable cause, both educationally and judicially. The almost universal infection of American education by the pragmatic materialism of William James and John Dewey produced a generation of illiterates to whom the Constitution was an unknown document, something of

no contemporary interest handed down from a musty past.

To be steeped in a knowledge of the Constitution and its principles became an anachronism in what passes for progressive education. James' and Dewey's counterpart in jurisprudence was Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, who rejected the principles of natural law in favor of pragmatism. Fixed truth which cannot be set aside by majorities was a concept repugnant to Dewey and Holmes. Fadism rather than constitutionality became the overriding test in jurisprudence, and collectivism is the fad of the 20th Century.

An Independent Judiciary and Civil Liberties

NO OTHER President ever made a frontal attack upon the Constitution exceeding in effrontery that of Franklin D. Roosevelt when he sought to reduce the Supreme Court to the status of a White House appendage.

No other event in American history ever justified so completely the constitutional separation of powers as the action of the United States Senate in its blistering rejection of the President's consummate egotism. For a brief historical moment at least, the Senate stood between the American people and the Roosevelt assault upon their liberties. For his leadership in that crisis alone, the name of Senator Burton K. Wheeler bears an immortal glory.

After Congress refused Franklin

D. Roosevelt the passage of his court-packing bill, the passage of time (over which the Senate had no control) accomplished the same end result, namely, the near-destruction of the independent judiciary. As time, the inexorable leveler of all men, took its toll of Justice after Justice, Roosevelt's replacements, with one exception, were New Deal politicians amenable to White House whims. One of these New Deal replacements on the highest tribunal of the land was rewarded for his total lack of moral courage in dealing with the open insurrection of lawless mobs in the state of which he was governor. This open insurrection which trampled upon basic liberties guaranteed by the Constitution was euphemistically called a sit-down strike, one of whose leading actors was Walter Reuther, darling of the New Deal totalitarian liberals. Who among the fake liberals of the country spoke up in defense of civil liberties when Murphy's insurrection swept the State of Michigan? Those self-styled liberals who now prate of civil rights for Communists were seized with lockjaw.

In the crisis of the court-packing episode, the names of McReynolds, Sutherland, Van Devanter, and Butler shone with a peculiar lustre. It would be an interesting test of present-day education to ascertain how many college graduates of 1953 could tell the significance of those names in American history. It is a safe guess that more college men of

this year would be able correctly to identify Tinker, Evers and Chance than would know anything about that crisis for Civil Liberties.

The vital importance of an independent judiciary was second to none in the minds of the authors of the Constitution. *The Federalist*, No. 78 declared: "The complete independence of the courts of justice is peculiarly essential in a limited Constitution." The same issue of *The Federalist* quoted approvingly the words of Montesquieu that "there is no liberty, if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers."

As though anticipating the constitutional crisis which was precipitated by Roosevelt and the New Deal adherents of democracy, *The Federalist*, No. 78 said: "This independence of the judges is equally requisite to guard the Constitution and the rights of individuals from the effects of those ill humors, which the arts of designing men, or the influence of particular conjunctures, sometimes disseminate among the people themselves, and which, though they speedily give place to better information and more deliberate reflection, have a tendency, in the meantime, to occasion dangerous innovations in the government and serious oppressions of the minor party in the community."

The framers of the Constitution were, perhaps, too optimistic about the ability of the people to repel "the arts of designing men."

The Social Security Act and the General Welfare Clause

UNDER the doctrine of providing for "the general welfare," the New Dealers enacted the Social Security Act in August, 1935. Authority for such legislation was not specifically delegated by the states to the Congress of the United States and it is, therefore, out of bounds, constitutionally speaking. Under the Constitution, Congress possesses enumerated powers and no others. This is elementary in constitutional principles.

The Social Security Act provides what amounts to a federal subsidy for indigence and incompetence. In its compulsory character, it does violence to the liberties of more millions than are subsidized by this use of the policeman's club to confiscate the wealth of competent and enterprising citizens.

The whole system of federal social security is a bookkeeping fraud which, if practiced by private insurance companies, would land thousands of insurance company officials in jail. As it has been administered, the federal social security system is totally without assets save the power of Congress to tax, and for this purpose the taxing power is unauthorized, illegal and unconstitutional. When citizens are apathetic toward their liberties, the usurpers of power go uncurbed and unproved.

The General Welfare Clause of the Constitution will no more justify

the Social Security Act than it will sanction the unconstitutional Truman seizure of the steel industry. Both the social security system and the steel seizure were expressions of the fascist tendencies of the Roosevelt-Truman era. Outraged public opinion and that last vestige of independence which remains in the highest court dealt a crushing blow to the megalomania of Mr. Truman when he imagined himself possessed of inherent and boundless powers to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the several states. On the other hand, public apathy and judicial subservience prevailed when the monstrous give-away program, euphemistically called social security, was adopted by Congress and subsequently upheld by the Supreme Court. The blood of the people's liberties slowly oozes from the wounds inflicted by the enemies of constitutionalism.

The logic of the Social Security Act, carried to its conclusion, would support an act of Congress to Take Everything Away from Everybody by Taxation and to Give Everybody Everything in the Name of the General Welfare, and the Constitution Be Damned. The cynical contempt for the Constitution and the people's liberties exhibited by Franklin D. Roosevelt and his Rasputin, Harry Hopkins, led the former to counsel Congress to ignore questions of constitutionality in considering his "must" legislation, and the latter to state his notorious philosophy of

New Deal government as one of *taxing, spending, and electing*.

CARDINAL principles of the Roosevelt-Truman doctrine are the calculated destruction of individual incentive and the socialistic re-distribution of wealth. Both presidents, having been notorious and total failures in business themselves, took a devilish delight in penalizing success. For millions of Americans, vital civil liberties perished under the impact of their mischievous anti-success complex.

One of the preposterous aspects of the Social Security Act is that it operates without regard to individual need. Millionaires as well as paupers are entitled to its alleged alleviations of old-age hazards. In the administration of the compulsory federal unemployment insurance, the Gargantuan bureaucracy has adopted a definition of unemployment which is preposterous in the ultimate degree. Jobs by the million may go begging for takers, but the fictitious unemployed are not obligated to accept employment if they personally and subjectively deem the jobs unsuitable to their talents. They may, instead, eat the swill of paternalism at the New Deal trough.

The issue of the General Welfare Clause and its interpretation was bitterly debated even before the ratification of the Constitution by the states. In the New York convention particularly, it was contended

that the delegated power of Congress to tax and spend for the general welfare of the United States (Article I, Section 8, first paragraph) was an unlimited grant, a boundless field of power by which a reckless national legislature could contrive to obliterate the independence and the liberties of the several states.

James Madison, the most brilliant constitutionalist of them all, replied angrily to this tortured interpretation of the General Welfare Clause by saying, in effect, that its proponents were unable to comprehend the meaning of plain English. Madison pointed out that, if the first paragraph of Section 8, Article I, were a grant of power without clearly defined limits, there would be no excuse for the specific enumeration of powers in the succeeding seventeen paragraphs. Assuming the role of a lecturer on English and logic, Madison explained with irrefutable cogency that "nothing is more natural nor common than first to use a general phrase, and then to explain and qualify it by a recital of particulars." In other words, the meaning of the first paragraph, granting Congress the power to tax and to spend in order to "provide for the common defence and general welfare," was rigorously limited by the specific enumeration of powers in the succeeding seventeen paragraphs. Under the Common Defence and General Welfare Clause, therefore, Congress has no powers whatsoever other than those set

forth in the seventeen paragraphs. Any other powers exercised by Congress constitute a usurpation.

THOMAS JEFFERSON, the misappropriated saint of the New Deal, was as emphatic as Madison in his rejection of the latitudinarian interpretation of the General Welfare Clause. In 1817, Jefferson wrote: ". . . that Congress has not unlimited powers to provide for the general welfare, but was restrained to those specifically enumerated; and that, as it was never meant that they should provide for that welfare but by the exercise of the enumerated powers, so it could not have meant that they should raise money for purposes which the enumeration did not place under their action; consequently, that the specification of powers is a limitation on the purposes for which they may raise money."

Nothing is clearer than that Jefferson would have written scathing veto messages for the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation Act, the Bituminous Coal Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and the Social Security Act.

There is a bitter irony in the spectacle of the New Deal miscreants erecting a statue to Thomas Jefferson on the bank of the Potomac Basin.

Franklin D. Roosevelt and his

rubber-stamp congressmen were recalcitrant to their oaths to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and would have been sent into political exile by any but an apathetic people careless of their liberties.

Democracy and Civil Liberties

THE incessant and ubiquitous mouthings about democracy now characteristic of press and radio are a warning of how far we have drifted from an understanding of liberty under a republican form of government, which is the only form known to the Constitution.

The authors of the Constitution knew well the pitfalls of democracy. To avoid them, they set up safeguards against the tyranny of democracy, among them being the separation of powers, the system of checks and balances, life tenure for judges during good behavior, the difficulty of the amending process, the indirect election of Senators, equal representation of the States in the Senate, the indirect election of the President, the presidential veto, the requirement of a two-thirds vote in both houses of Congress to override the veto, and the judicial review of legislative and executive acts.

The three Democratic Party presidents of the 20th Century, each loudly proclaiming a passionate devotion to peace, lied us into three wholly unnecessary wars. (The phrase, "lied us into war," is from

Clare Booth Luce's dramatic address to the Republican Convention of 1944.) The net effect of the Wilson War, the Roosevelt War, and the Truman War (dishonestly named the First World War, World War II, and the Korean War, respectively) has been a loss of liberties which we shall not soon, if ever, regain. Wholly apart from the horrible conscription and casualty lists, these wars of the three presidential megalomaniacs have imposed upon the American economy a burden whose destructiveness no man can measure; and upon millions of individual Americans a system of confiscatory taxation (utterly unconstitutional in its

obedience to the principles of Karl Marx) which will drastically circumscribe the liberties of many unborn generations, not to mention our own.

If American history is written, ultimately, by libertarians rather than by Communists or their kiss and kin, the Socialists and the A.D.A., no man will envy the historical niche assigned to Woodrow Wilson or Franklin Roosevelt or Harry Truman.

If, on the other hand, our history continues to be set down by these totalitarian-minded amanuenses, the question of civil liberties will not matter.



» Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters. — *Edmund Burke*

» I resent at any time or any place the attitude that the safety of this country depends on any man holding his job. No man has achieved that strength, and this country has not deteriorated to that weakness. — *Owen D. Young*

» A government for the people must depend for its success on the intelligence, the morality, the justice, and the interest of the people themselves. — *Grover Cleveland*

» I think we have more machinery of government than is necessary, too many parasites living on the labor of the industrious.

— *Thomas Jefferson*

AGENDA FOR THE SECOND ELIZABETHAN AGE



BY A. L. ROWSE, FELLOW OF ALL SOULS COLLEGE, OXFORD

HERE we are in the middle of the twentieth century, with a young queen, a second Elizabeth, arriving at the throne at just the same age as that remarkable woman, the first Elizabeth, and with a man who is already a grand part of English history at her side as Prime Minister. It must occur to many people to wonder what our prospects are in the second Elizabethan Age now opening before us, and whether we are likely to do as well as our ancestors did in their day.

We shall have to do very well indeed to achieve as much as the men of Elizabethan England did with their very limited resources.

Consider how much they accomplished with how little. It was a small population of only five million that brought about the great advances of the Elizabethan Age; that defeated the world-empire of Spain, in control of the treasure-supplies of the New World; that laid open North America to English



colonization; that laid the foundations — in voyages of discovery and trading expeditions across the oceans opening up new markets — of the British Empire to which we owe our place in the world and our very safety and security as a people.

How did this small people do it?

In the first place theirs was the most efficient society of the time in Europe — taut, spare, vigorous, athletic, with no superfluous flesh, pulsating with energy. It was a very competitive society, flexible and with plenty of room for people to move up — or down. Careers were certainly open to talents — look at the astonishing careers of people like Francis Drake or Shakespeare, Bess of Hardwick or Raleigh, who all started life with very little.

But it was a society that offered rewards to incentive, enterprise, push. It did not gear its pace to the slackest, the slowest, or the stupidest. And indeed any society that

does so is in danger in the struggle for survival that is, after all, the fundamental fact of life.

Moreover, it had a proper appreciation of the importance, indeed the necessity, of *profit* to make the wheels of enterprise go round.

THE Queen herself had a very keen eye to profit. She expected the voyages she backed and into which she put capital — in the form of ships or cash — to pay for themselves and to pay her a handsome return. Few of them could be expected to yield such a return as Drake's voyage round the world, which she planned with Drake behind the back of her own Lord Treasurer; Drake's capture of the Spanish treasure ship enabled the voyage to pay the Queen something like 1,400 per cent. She graciously allowed him £10,000 of the proceeds (multiply by twenty-five for a contemporary valuation!). With a small portion of the rest the Levant Company was founded; out of that came the East India Company, and out of that came the Indian Empire, one of the most extraordinary achievements in history. It all goes back to that voyage of Drake's little ship, the *Golden Hind*.

Drake had a no less keen eye for what mattered. When a young man, he and John Hawkins were well nigh ruined by the Spanish Viceroy's breaking his pledged word and turning on their trading ships in the port of Vera Cruz and practically scup-

pering the whole expedition. A year or two later Drake took his revenge with his descent in two small boats on the Isthmus of Panama, capturing the treasure-train to Nombre de Dios. Out of his legitimate grievances he made a fortune. And a very keen eye he had for investing it, both at home and abroad, in land, property in Plymouth, corn-mills along the water-supply he brought into the town, and in trading and exploratory expeditions overseas. His family still owns the land he won for them. Such men — he was certainly an entrepreneur, in all senses of the word — have been the makers of the British Empire and of the place we enjoy in the world.

Queen Elizabeth I inherited her marked financial ability from her canny grandfather, the Welshman, Henry VII. She and her Lord Treasurer, Burghley, not only watched over and nursed the country's young industrial development, but kept a close eye on the nation's accounts, scrutinizing every pound that was spent. No detail was too small to escape them, no trouble too great to keep the country solvent.

THAT was the greatest single factor in the country's success: the fact that this country remained solvent, when all the leading countries abroad — including Spain — went bankrupt. I should say, especially Spain; for, in spite of the treasure from America, the overstrain of her financial resources was

responsible for Spain's decline. While Elizabeth's good management and careful fostering of the country's resources — and her seeing to it that the empire lived within them — enabled Britain to go up in the world.

I have often thought in these last few years if only we had had Elizabeth and old Burghley at the Treasury still, how much better we should have done. And how much safer we should have been!

For, if there is one thing above all else that the second Elizabethan Age needs to learn from the first, it is that a country or an enterprise, a business or an individual, has to live within its own resources. It has to cut its coat according to its cloth. More than a pint can't be got out of a pint-pot. The truth is as simple as that.

BUT it is the simple truths that people are likely to lose sight of — especially, it seems to me, in these late years. The fundamental underlying facts of economic life are there all the same, even if we like to close our eyes to them. And that is dangerous, especially with an economy as sensitive as ours; for they are likely to catch up with us all the more drastically. We, of all people in the world — so dependent on the outside world for our very livelihood, for raw materials and for food — can least of all afford to entertain illusions about the facts of life. We are all in favor of social

welfare; but we can afford only as much social welfare as we earn. Before a business — or the country — can think of spending on welfare, it has got to be sure that it can exist. Existence comes first; we have got to succeed in the struggle to survive.

The Elizabethans were great realists about this. They realized that fundamentally life is a struggle and a grim one. But they were not afraid of it; they were tough and determined, not merely to put up a good show, but to get the best out of it, to do better than other people if possible. In a sense, they had a more adult view of life than we have; they did not cushion themselves with illusions; they were prepared to accept the facts of *la condition humaine*.

We have a great deal to learn from them, if the second Elizabethan Age is going to be anything like as successful as the first.

I have been asked, as an historian, to answer the straight question: "Has our sense of profit become too blunted to make this second era of an Elizabeth comparable with the first?" I am sorry to say that I shall have to answer "Yes" — unless we wake up in time to the facts of economic life.

In the simplest sense, profit means a surplus over expenditure. There has got to be a surplus somewhere, or the thing goes under: it can't run on a loss. Or, if it does, the loss is made up from a surplus somewhere else. In the complexity of our mod-

ern economic system — especially where it is semi-socialised — the losses are apt to be disguised. But that is all the more dangerous: the more it is controlled, the more the whole economy sags downwards.

In its simplest sense, profit acts as a useful indicator to enable each enterprise to see how it stands. As in our own individual cash accounts. But so many things today conspire to blur the picture and disguise the facts of life. Yet the facts cannot be conjured away by wishing: they remain and catch up with us in the end.

What is wrong with profit, anyway?

IN MY BOOK, *The England of Elizabeth*, I said, "The motive of profit has been responsible for far greater achievements in human history than ever the absence of it has been, hasn't it?" This shocked the eminent Professor Tawney, who quoted it as something against the book. He could hardly believe that anyone could say such a thing, so contrary to contemporary orthodoxy. Yet, in simple fact, it is true, isn't it?

For there is the further consideration of profit as an incentive. The operation of incentive in our economic system is so subtle and sensitive a thing that, if it is discouraged or damaged in any way, the damage spreads like a disease through all the cells of the system. It is impossible to catch up with it or arrest it.

Yet almost everything we do nowadays has the effect of undermining incentive. We make social services far too easy to come by. Fifty years ago — when we were a far richer country — no doubt they were inadequate. Now, when we are much poorer — after two destructive wars in one generation and the wiping out of much of our capital investment abroad — we pile on far more in the way of social services than our economy can afford or than people actually are demanding.

But it is the effect on incentive, initiative, enterprise that is so dangerous.

If there are not differential rewards for different contributions of work in the community, why should anyone try to work harder than anyone else? It very shortly becomes people's motive to avoid work as much as possible, not to do a decent day's work for a decent day's pay; or, higher up the scale, in administration and management, in industry or civil service, to pass the buck, to shirk responsibility, to take a safe passive line of acquiescence instead of striking out boldly and actively with new initiatives. After all, why should they take the risks, if the risks are not rewarded? Tails you lose, heads you do not win; for it all goes in tax.

Everyone notices the decline in the willingness to take risks nowadays, that younger people play for safety and secure bureaucratic

jobs, compared with the competitiveness, the spirit of enterprise, the readiness to start new businesses, to try their hands overseas, as in the years before 1914.

And this at a time when circumstances in the world have dangerously altered for us. No longer the easy security of living on the accumulated capital of Victorian hard work — as if the world owed it to us that we should by right enjoy a higher standard of living than we earn: other people do not think so; hence some of our difficulties with them, Egyptians and Persians among others.

So it is of no use our living on the capital of late Victorian luxury-ideas either, in our altered and reduced circumstances. Like the Elizabethans, we are brought up against the hard facts of life in the world, from which they set out to win a position for us.

I have just been reading a remarkable book, *The Next Million Years*, by Sir Charles Darwin, grandson of the greatest of Victorian scientists. With the strong common-sense and hard realism of a Darwin, he makes us face the fundamental fact in human history as far as we can see. We have conquered disease and the natural causes that keep down population, so that world population grows in geometrical progression. The food supplies of the

world increase in only arithmetical progression, and there is a foreseeable limit to their increase at all. There is no chance of their being able to catch up with the increase in world population.

We are down to bedrock: the basic fact of human history is the struggle of human groups for the available supplies of food for them to exist. Where do we come in, in a world with 200 million Russians, 400 million Indians, 500 million Chinese, all of them henceforth increasing rapidly? That fact is at the base of many of our troubles.

What are we to do, with a population of 50 million shut up in a small island, and with an extremely delicate and sensitive economy that has been deranged and put out of gear by two world wars in our time?

I think I know the answers; though whether people would like them is another matter.

All I can say here is that, if our population of 50 million faces their difficulties and problems in the spirit in which the 5 million of our Elizabethan ancestors faced theirs, we ought to be able to do well in the world still. For, after all, it is the spirit that counts — the enterprise, courage, endurance; and, if the effort is a tough one, the world hard, life a struggle — isn't that invigorating rather than not, inspiring even, making life worth living?



» Popularity? It is glory's small change.

— Victor Hugo

The s-i-z-z-l-i-n-g Seat of HERBERT BROWNELL

By JAMES ANDREW MAYER

THERE are some very hot seats around the cabinet table of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. There are the chairs, for instance, of the Secretaries of State, of the Treasury, National Defense, Agriculture, and of Labor, all charged with enough sizzling political issues to keep their occupants squirming during the months to come.

Probably the hottest seat of all is the one occupied by a medium-sized, middle-aged, balding New York politician, a former chairman of the Republican National Committee, the man who brain-trusted General Eisenhower's nomination at Chicago, Herbert Brownell, Attorney General of the United States.

He was placed in his cabinet seat, of course, by Governor Thomas E. Dewey, who at this writing appears to be the power behind the Eisenhower throne.

The man who carefully — and some say calculatingly — wired Mr. Brownell's new chair for high-voltage political electricity is a little Philadelphia lawyer with a pixy Irish face and a pixy Irish humor,

Brownell's immediate predecessor in office, Judge James Patrick McGranery. McGranery, they say, is a man with a canny, canny sense of political currents.

And the man Washington insiders believe is itching to pull the switch on the new Attorney General is a tall, spare U. S. Senator of renowned ability, long memory and many grievances, the man from whom Mr. Brownell helped to snatch the mantle of "Mr. Republican," Robert Alphonso Taft of Ohio.

Brownell's appointment as Attorney General was one of the two outright political appointments to the Eisenhower cabinet. Like Arthur E. Summerfield, the new Postmaster General, Brownell's sole outstanding qualification for the job was his political influence. But, whereas the Postmaster Generalship over the years has come to be regarded as the vested right of the chairman of the reigning party, Brownell moved into a spot where political influence was one of the scandals that rocked the Truman administration and helped unseat the Democrats.

EVEN if the Department of Justice were faced with nothing but routine business in the months to come, the policies of General Brownell would be subjected to keen Congressional scrutiny, from members of both parties. But some of the business in the hands of the new Attorney General is far from routine. The aforementioned Mr. McGranery has seen to that. With a bland Irish smile and the most cordial good wishes, Mr. McGranery dumped into the lap of Mr. Brownell a mess of legal hot potatoes, so sizzling that the latter gentleman will need all of his vaunted political dexterity to handle them without getting his fingers very badly burnt.

Moreover, Mr. McGranery played on Mr. Brownell a very dirty Irish trick. In his brief tenure of office he built up what even his critics admit was an excellent record, and one which will prove rather difficult for his successor to match. With a minimum of fuss and fanfare he cleared out of all branches of the department a sizable collection of dead and decaying wood. He fired officials right and left; some because he detected the soil on their sticky little fingers, others simply because they were downright lazy or incompetent. He started moving cases that had been gathering dust in the department's files so long that only the oldest employes were vaguely aware of their presence. He bolstered the morale of the department, which had sunk to a low ebb under his

immediate predecessors. He brought into key positions a group of young lawyers who made up in energy, ambition and drive what they lacked in legal experience. And he proceeded to crack down with all his Irish pugnacity on Communists, racketeers and Big Business.

Right here is where the potential political embarrassment of Mr. Brownell begins. One of the few issues on which the Eisenhower Republicans and the Truman Democrats are fundamentally divided is the interpretation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Republicans traditionally give the law a liberal interpretation. They regard only outright monopolies as being in violation. The Truman Democrats however, take a most flexible view of the law. They tend to regard mere business bigness as monopoly, *per se*. They view almost any and all business relationships between American firms and their foreign competitors as cartel practices — and they have made the word “cartel” one of the most damning epithets in international economic lingo.

Out of their strict interpretation of the antitrust laws, hundreds of Republican lawyers of unimpeachable integrity, would, if in Attorney General Brownell's shoes, feel fully justified in moving for dismissal, say, of the suit against the five American oil companies. And the suit against these five companies is one of the biggest and hottest

potatoes that the smiling Mr. McGranery dumped in Mr. Brownell's lap.

AS HE did this Judge McGranery must have recalled his own reaction when President Truman, under strong senatorial pressure, dumped the oil case in the McGranery lap with curt orders to present it to the grand jury for action. McGranery at the time was a very unhappy man. The case against the oil companies had been based on "evidence" contained in a Tariff Commission report, which had been prepared under the direction of two of Washington's most fanatical zealots against business bigness. McGranery was highly dubious of the validity of their "evidence" and a precursory study tended to confirm his first opinion.

But orders from the White House are orders from All-High, and McGranery and his aides proceeded to dig into the situation to see if a case could be made. And the deeper McGranery dug the more his doubts diminished, until finally he appeared at his office one morning, cocky and smiling. He not only had a case against the oil companies, he told friends, but he had a "damned good case." And he swiftly outlined three separate procedures: he asked criminal indictments in grand jury actions against five major oil companies, Standard of New Jersey, Standard of California, Socony-Vacuum, Texas and Gulf; he

prepared civil proceedings against the same five companies, seeking a cease-and-desist order; and he brought suit against the first four companies and six subsidiaries, to recover \$67 million in alleged overcharges against the Economic Cooperation Administration and its successor, the Mutual Security Agency.

And the deeper McGranery dug the madder the executives of the major oil companies became. There was nothing synthetic about the wrathful press releases issued by the companies. The very bringing of antitrust action by the U. S. government was causing serious difficulties in their already delicate relations with Middle Eastern and Latin American governments. And if the companies are compelled to reveal full details of their overseas operations, as McGranery insisted they must, the oilmen predict violent repercussions all the way from Venezuela to the Persian Gulf. The British government, whose Anglo-Iranian and Royal Dutch Shell companies were also named in the original actions but later dropped, were equally choleric in their anger and some of the things the British Ambassador is reported to have said to Secretary Acheson just should not be said by the ambassador of a friendly country to a friendly Secretary of State.

WHETHER because of British pressure, the heated protests of the oil companies, or the honest

concern of the armed forces at the threat to American-owned Middle Eastern oil reserves, the Truman cabinet, in a surprising last-minute reversal, recommended that the government call the whole thing off. Acheson, Secretary Sawyer of Commerce and Secretary Lovett of National Defense (the last-named, as the antitrust boys point out with heavy significance, a stalwart Republican who somehow strayed into the Truman administration) led the fight for reversal, with McGranery putting up a lone and some say vitriolic fight to push the cases to the limit. McGranery was especially provoked at charges by Interior Secretary Chapman, who joined the opposition, that Justice lawyers misrepresented to the grand jury the effects of the alleged oil cartel on domestic production.

But, while McGranery lost the cabinet battle, the details of which were quickly leaked to the press, he was by no means through. He went directly to the President, reminded him that he, McGranery, had been reluctant to start criminal proceedings in the first place, but, now that he had built up a strong case, he was hanged if he would just let the whole matter drop. He would, he told the President, agree to dropping the criminal proceedings if the oil companies, as basis for the government's civil action, would produce the records that the grand jury had already subpoenaed. That, the President agreed, seemed rea-

sonable enough, and McGranery is said to have quickly smothered a triumphant smile. He knew that he had won. He knew that the oil companies would never accept the conditions, that they would fight all the way to the Supreme Court before they would permit the records in question to be spread before the public in a court of law, with the diplomatic representatives of a dozen oil-producing countries noting every detail (not to mention the major consuming nations).

As McGranery predicted, the oil companies rejected the terms with a new flurry of furious press statements, and there the case stood as it was turned over to Attorney General Brownell.

And here is where the political electricity reaches almost lethal voltage, as far as Mr. Brownell is concerned. In view of the amazing reversal of the Truman cabinet, almost any other Attorney General could, with a minimum of public protest, dismiss the criminal action and work out an agreement with the companies to accept a mild consent decree, all on the ground of national interest. But not Attorney General Herbert Brownell, the man who directed the behind-scenes operations of the Eisenhower campaigns. For it is widely known in Washington and throughout the country that the big oil interests contributed heavily to the Eisenhower campaigns both before and

after his nomination. Politics being what it is, the cynics in Congress and the press would place a most unfortunate interpretation on any concession Mr. Brownell makes to the oil companies. Any indication of his pulling his punches in either the criminal action or the civil suits is almost certain to provoke a storm of heated controversy.

In fact, when he appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee for the hearing on his nomination, Brownell was questioned sharply about his intentions in the oil case, and he pledged to push all actions vigorously. And if he does, the wrath of the oil companies will be transferred from James Patrick McGranery to Herbert Brownell before you can say "*res gestae*," and when the big oil barons become angry they can be very mean, indeed.

BUT, hot as the case against the oil companies is, Mr. Brownell has inherited from Mr. McGranery another antitrust file which is loaded with even more political dynamite — a case that thus far has not been revealed to the public.

For more than two and one-half years the ace lawyers of the Anti-trust Division have been quietly probing into the far-flung operations of the vast United States Steel Corporation empire. When McGranery entered the office of Attorney General, they handed him a case against the steel company

which had been prepared for presentation to the grand jury — a case which would rock American Big Business to its very foundations if upheld by the courts, whether in a civil or a criminal proceeding. The case prepared against U. S. Steel is said to challenge the principle of large industrial enterprises branching out into affiliated — and sometimes nonaffiliated — industries, such as steel companies' owning and controlling mines, shipping firms, docks, railroads, smelters, chemical concerns, and huge merchandising organizations. An adverse court decision would shake American industry in a way that it has not been shaken since the trust-busting days of President Theodore Roosevelt. And after carefully studying the file McGranery told associates in the department that he regarded it as one of the strongest antitrust cases he had come across in his extensive legal career.

Nevertheless, McGranery held up the grand jury presentation. At the time the government was embroiled in its bitter controversy with the steel industry over President Truman's peremptory seizure of their mills. And McGranery was certain that to have brought action at that time would convey the impression that the government was arbitrarily cracking down on Big Steel, for the sole purpose of punishing the company for its temerity in fighting the seizure of its plants.

By the time the steel strike was

settled, the nation was in the midst of the presidential campaign, and McGranery again held up the action, fearing that the case would be prejudiced by public suspicion that it was instigated by political motives; it was pretty generally known which side of the presidential race the big steelmen were betting on.

Then, when the election returns came in, and the Democrats, including McGranery, learned they had been swept from office, the Attorney General called the whole thing off, as far as his administration was concerned. He felt that submission of the case to the grand jury by the lame-duck administration would have all the elements of petty spite work by a defeated political party. So he carefully wrapped up the file, and presented it along with his other sizzling little gifts, to Herbert Brownell, to take whatever action he might see fit.

THE new Attorney General has three courses open to him: he can drop the matter entirely; he can institute civil proceedings aimed at forcing a dissolution of Big Steel's industrial empire; or he can shoot the works and seek criminal indictments. Either of the latter two courses would be regarded as the rankest political treason by almost the entire business community, and would have unpredictable effects on the nation's economy and the war effort. On the other

hand, if he attempts to drop the matter he is certain to draw fire from the Democratic opposition, who are fully convinced that the public, in the long run, will firmly support their fight against the "monopolistic" practices of Big Business. Full details of the department's file on the U. S. Steel Corporation are already known to members of Congress, and undoubtedly will be passed along, at the appropriate time, to the Washington press corps, which is overwhelmingly suspicious of Big Business, whatever the convictions of the papers they represent may be.

There is nothing in Attorney General Brownell's record to indicate that he will be motivated by anything but his own interpretation of the law, and the evidence contained in the department's files, in disposing of the steel case. As was previously pointed out, the Democratic and Republican interpretations of the Sherman Act are so diverse that McGranery may be sincerely convinced that the case against the company is "one of the strongest" he has ever seen, and Brownell be equally honest in believing that no case exists at all.

But unfortunately his close affiliation in a political campaign that was strongly supported by the steel industry — and practically all business — big, medium-sized, and small — will undoubtedly bring down upon him charges of political intrigue, if he fails to bring action.

THE oil and steel cases are only two of nearly a dozen antitrust actions passed on by McGranery to his successor, and most of them contain awkward political aspects. There is a civil suit against the three leading soap producers, Procter and Gamble, Lever Brothers, and Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, charged with monopolizing the manufacture and sale of soap and detergents; there is a grand jury indictment against the major New York diamond importers, alleged to have boycotted the German diamond industry; a civil action against the American News Company and its subsidiary, Union News Company, alleged to have monopolized the distribution of magazines to newstands; and several suits against local "monopolies," some of them naming labor unions in addition to companies, which seems like something of political heresy on the part of Fair Dealer McGranery, himself.

It is possible that Mr. Brownell may find some welcome relief in the civil complaint against twelve major motion picture producing and distributing companies, the picture industry having played both sides of the political fence so enthusiastically during the past several years, that Brownell could hardly be accused of political bias in this case, no matter what action he might decide upon.

But it is not only in the antitrust sphere that political difficulties lurk for Mr. Brownell. One of Mc-

Granery's pleasant innovations in the department was to slap denaturalization and deportation proceedings on a score of top-flight, foreign-born racketeers, whose activities were exposed in recent Congressional and state investigations. The list of names involved in the proceedings reads like a "Who's Who," of the American underworld: Frank Costello, Thomas Luchese (alias Three-Finger Brown), Vito Genovese, Albert Anastasia, Anthony Ricci (alias Tony Gobel), Anthony Volpe, Albert P. Polizzi, Hyman Stromberg (alias Nig Rosen), Samuel Accardi, Hyman Pincus, Angelo Meli, Jack Dragna and Meyer Lansky.

McGranery also ordered deportation actions taken against several top-ranking Communists, and cracked down on other Communists, and fellow travelers on charges ranging from the filing of false affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board, to the perjury indictment returned against Owen Lattimore.

All the cases against the Communists, fellow travelers and the plain, ordinary racketeers were in various stages of legal proceedings when Mr. Brownell took office. The cases against the Communists he can push with all the vigor at his command—and he undoubtedly will—and receive nothing but applause from the American press and public (except for the lunatic fringe).

The cases against the racket boys are something else again. There have long been rumors of close ties between the mobs and high-ranking New York Republicans. First support for the reported links between the GOP and the racket leaders came with the recent disclosure that Luchese's citizenship rights were restored after a felony conviction, on the intercession of the Republican leader of the New York State Senate, Arthur Wicks, of Kingston.

THAT, briefly, is the background against which Attorney General Brownell must act in the denaturalization proceedings against Luchese, Costello, and other Luciano henchmen, all of whom can be counted upon to fight deportation to the bitter end, and to engage the shrewdest racket lawyers of the country in the battle.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that Justice Department lawyers have privately stated that some of the proceedings against the big racketeers are of extremely dubious legal validity. Any prosecutor, anxious to maintain a good record, would be fully justified in asking dismissals in some of these cases, it is said.

But not Attorney General Brownell. Any such move on his part,

at this particular time, would certainly raise an uproar in his own New York political backyard. Even if the cases are thrown out on motion of defense counsel, which may very possibly happen, there are unkind souls who will be convinced that the Attorney General was guilty of pulling his punches.

There are those who know Mr. Brownell who are confident that he will successfully meet the challenges of his new post, and that the delicate political issues involved in so many cases now pending will only serve to enhance his reputation in the end. They point out that Brownell's personal integrity has never been challenged, that he is an able lawyer even though he never achieved distinction, and that his political adroitness should prove a valuable asset in handling the explosive issues awaiting his action.

And it must be conceded that in one respect the Dewey-Eisenhower appointee has an unparalleled opportunity. If he can survive the next two years in the Department of Justice without providing a wealth of political ammunition for the opposition party, he will go down in history not only as a great Attorney General, but also as one of the shrewdest political tacticians of all time.



» How glorious it is — and also how painful — to be an exception.
— *Alfred De Musset*

THE SAD STORY OF LAMAR CAUDLE

Edited by RALPH DE TOLEDANO

When the 82nd Congress set out to clean the Augean Stables of the Truman administration, it found thievery, corruption, and venality. A House Ways and Means subcommittee headed by Representative Frank Chelf of Kentucky, investigating the Justice Department, somewhat relieved the odoriferous atmosphere when it placed Theron Lamar Caudle on the stand. Clumsily protesting his innocence in a strong North Carolina drawl, Caudle lent the first touch of comedy to the grim business. But it soon became apparent that he was less a buffoon and more a genuinely bewildered man, selected by the Democrats to take the rap for the real wrongdoers.

Recently, the Chelf Committee issued a 71-page report on Caudle, exculpating him with perhaps too much energy but placing him in a proper context. THE AMERICAN MERCURY has condensed this important document in order to give its readers what the com-

mittee called "a fair look into the innermost anatomy of a sick agency."

IN THE MINDS of many people who have been following exposures of scandal in the federal government in recent years, the name Theron Lamar Caudle and phrases like "the mess in Washington" are inextricably associated. The subcommittee and its staff share in the opinion that Caudle is an honorably motivated man. This does not rule out his shortcomings; he was weak, and the naive code of a country lawyer did not serve him well in the corrupting sophistication of the Washington he knew; he made errors of judgment; and he swallowed more in the name of personal loyalty than any man should stomach. But Caudle never sold himself for riches or for power. The career of this man is the most accurate reflection of decay within the Department of

Justice that the subcommittee has come upon.

The Chelf report briefly outlines Caudle's law career, showing that in the period of 1940-45, when he was U. S. Attorney for the Western District of North Carolina, his conduct was for the most part exemplary. The U. S. Attorney's office had been notorious when Caudle took it over, but he made it one of the best in the country. He also earned the friendship of Tom Clark, then an Assistant Attorney General, and showed that he could be extremely affable to the politically powerful when the occasion arose.

TOM CLARK was confirmed as Attorney General of the United States in July, 1945. A month later he telephoned Caudle and, to the latter's astonishment, invited him, with President Truman's concurrence, to take the post of Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, which had been vacated by Clark's elevation to the cabinet post.

Caudle came to Washington on September 17, 1945. He and his family were pleased and excited: "We knew that Washington was a dangerous place, but we wanted to take it on and see about it."

Had Caudle been more acute, or more familiar with department procedures, he might have been put on notice at once that the circumstances surrounding his accession to office were slightly unusual. Ordinarily,

the burdens of administering the entire Department of Justice and holding a cabinet post are so great that the Attorney General concerns himself exclusively with policy decisions. In this case, however, Tom Clark transferred the files relating to several important criminal cases (including the notorious Amerasia case) directly to his own office, and continued to handle them throughout. Caudle never saw these files and knew nothing of the disposition of the cases, though they were directly within his jurisdiction and were processed by his subordinates under Clark's personal direction. It is strongly suggested in the record that Clark also "lifted" certain important cases from other divisions during his incumbency as Attorney General.

Caudle's first real taste of crisis in the department came in 1946, when the *Kansas City Star* began making startling charges about votes stolen in the primary election of that year in Kansas City — an election in which Harry Truman was personally involved. The department received a flood of complaints, from official sources as well as from private citizens. Since interfering with voting rights in a national election is a federal crime, the department (and Caudle's Criminal Division) had direct responsibility and jurisdiction.

Because full-scale FBI investigations of matters involving entire communities are expensive, the de-

partment adheres to a policy of recommending preliminary investigations of limited scope. The head of the Civil Rights Section, Turner L. Smith, was ordered to prepare a memorandum calling for such a preliminary investigation. Caudle relates that the memorandum was drafted three times before it left his office for submission to the Attorney General, whose office in turn approved it before it was transmitted to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

Whoever was responsible for the final text — and Caudle admits approving it — the effect was to impose some unusual limitations on the FBI. The memorandum specified individuals by name, with the implied direction that the investigation should be confined to interviewing these individuals. They were, for the most part, the election officials themselves, who had been responsible for the situation and who obviously would not be eager to disclose irregularities of which they had knowledge.

WHEN the FBI returned its report, a 250-page document, it was carefully “analyzed” by the Civil Rights Section. The Attorney General had become personally concerned because of the publicity the situation was receiving, and Caudle recalls “that Mr. Peyton Ford talked to me about it.” (Ford was Special Assistant to the Attorney General at the time.) The upshot was that another memorandum was

prepared by Caudle and his staff, *recommending that the matter be closed and that no further investigation be conducted.* This was submitted to Ford, who advised that it was acceptable to the Attorney General, and the FBI was notified that the investigation was to be dropped.

So the episode might have ended had not Senator James P. Kem stirred everything up when he came to Congress. He made speeches of protest, exchanged correspondence with Clark, and threw the department into what Caudle describes as a full-scale “rat race.”

No further action emanated from Washington, however, until Attorney General Clark was requested to appear before a Senate investigating committee. This request caused great consternation. Caudle and Clark set to work together over the files, preparing a defense of the department’s position. The night before the committee meeting, Caudle recalls, the **two** of them spent almost the entire **night** studying the documents in Clark’s home.

At this juncture, after having borne primary responsibility for the matter from the outset, Caudle was suddenly and summarily relieved of all further responsibility. Clark would not even let him attend the hearings that morning. “I sure did beg to go,” Caudle testifies.

Shortly thereafter, while Clark was testifying on Capitol Hill, the matter was literally blasted into yet larger proportions as a national

scandal. Someone broke into the storage rooms of the courthouse in Kansas City, blew open a safe, and carted off the ballots which had been impounded there for study in connection with the fraud charges. Clark at once released a vigorous public statement, calling for a full investigation and prosecution of all the guilty persons involved.

Within a day or two after Clark excluded Caudle from the hearings, Peyton Ford took all the Kansas City files from the Civil Rights Section and retained them thereafter in his own office. Conferences and file reviews, sometimes attended by Clark himself, were held in a room on a different floor, normally assigned to another division. Members of Caudle's own staff were sent to Kansas City to work on the case, but reported back to Ford. Caudle was completely cut out.

Clark interfered with the routine functionings of the department — a gross departure from the usual channels of authority which has not yet been adequately explained or defended by any of the officials involved. Also unexplained is the ultimate result: Although the FBI investigation which was launched on a full scale after Caudle's exclusion is reported to have cost nearly a quarter of a million dollars, only four minor figures in this flagrant scandal were ever punished. Thirty others were indicted. But the cases against them evaporated as soon as public interest in the affair subsided.

II

THE Kansas City vote fraud case was the gravest crisis that challenged the Department of Justice under Tom Clark. Yet most of the officials who became involved in it fared unusually well in their subsequent careers. For example, Peyton Ford — as Clark's *alter ego* and growing favorite — contrived to build an impregnable empire of administrative power before Clark left to accept his Supreme Court appointment.

Caudle himself was not forgotten. By the fall of 1947, after two years of service in the Criminal Division, he was beginning to feel that he had "had enough." The Tax Division was, in his words, "a heavenly place," at this time the most desirable post in the department. Clark sent one of his assistants to sound Caudle out as to whether he would like to head this division. Caudle accepted, and professes to have been wholly unaware of the persistent rumors circulating at that time: that Clark was either paying him off for his compliant part in the Kansas City case, or was moving him out of the controversial Criminal Division post.

Caudle had experienced outside pressure while he was in charge of the Criminal Division. Members of Congress occasionally telephoned him about cases affecting their constituents. And David K. Niles, White House assistant responsible for minority groups, repeatedly

flooded his office with Jehovah's Witnesses, conscientious objectors, and other "unusual people" who came to protest the difficulties their brethren were having with the federal criminal laws.

Caudle told the subcommittee, "When you get the badge of authority on you in Washington, you are just invited everywhere all the time." He found himself swamped with social demands. "You would go to a big cocktail party over at the Statler, or the Carlton, or the Mayflower, and you had no business to do with anybody who gave the thing, and then in just about four or five months, here he was. . . . always wanting something. They never came to the door unless they wanted something. It became quite a problem to me."

But his troubles began in earnest when he took over the Tax Division. The cocktail party invitations, with their inevitable aftermath of requests for special consideration, "got so numerous . . . I just could not go to all of them and keep up with my work." The same attorneys, acting as local or special counsel, came to him again and again, seeking conferences on behalf of persons who had got into tax difficulties in all sections of the country.

PRESSURES from Capitol Hill likewise increased when he took his new office. Caudle stressed that these attempted interventions, by attorneys and by members of Con-

gress, involved no direct impropriety. His chief objection arose from the vast burden they imposed on his time and patience. He was fully aware that, by the very act of telephoning about a particular case, prominent officials were seeking to exert "a degree of influence" on him.

In 1951 an indictment for tax understatements, allegedly in excess of \$500,000, was obtained against one Ray Shapiro of Milwaukee, and his wife. Shapiro's attorney, Swidler, came to Washington and sought postponement of the trial from Caudle, on the grounds that Mrs. Shapiro was in very poor health. Doctors appointed by the court had reached the conclusion, in perfectly good faith, that she could not stand trial. Since the tax returns in question had been filed in her name, it was the opinion of the United States Attorney at Milwaukee, Timothy Cronin, that dismissing the counts against her would wreck the prosecution of Shapiro himself.

The Shapiros engaged ex-Senator Scott Lucas as their counsel in Washington, and rumors of a "fix" began to fly. Lucas called on his former colleague, ex-Senator McGrath, who was now Attorney General, and McGrath arranged a conference with Caudle.

Caudle apparently felt genuine sympathy for Mrs. Shapiro, but he took the position that, since the matter was already in court, any leniency towards her would have to be sought from the judge. Cronin

shared this attitude. There were strong implications, from facts gathered by the Treasury agents, that Shapiro himself was aggravating his wife's condition in a despicable effort to head off prosecution. After Lucas' intervention, the matter was allowed to drag on for several months, with Mrs. Shapiro remaining under the supervision of the physicians appointed by the Milwaukee court.

Then Lucas called on Caudle a second time. Again McGrath personally arranged the interview, urging that Lucas be given every consideration. After talking with Lucas, Caudle suggested to McGrath that a representative of the department call on the judge and explain the policy of the Tax Division against prosecuting when the defendant's health would not stand the ordeal of trial. Ellis N. Slack, then heading the Appellate Section in the Tax Division, was chosen for the mission. He told the judge that "we would have no objection if he wanted to favorably consider discontinuing the case against her if it was a case of saving her life." This was in itself a highly unusual intervention, when the case had already reached the trial stage; but Slack went even further by urging the judge to throw the case out of court.

While all this was transpiring, the division had withheld the companion civil suit to recover the unpaid taxes. The judge stood firm in the criminal prosecution in spite of

Slack's appearance, refusing to drop Mrs. Shapiro. When the trial commenced, Shapiro pleaded guilty and received a three-year sentence. Then Mrs. Shapiro's case was dismissed. The civil suit is still pending.

III

THE Tax Division which Caudle headed was divided into four sections. Most outside interest was centered in the Fraud Section, where cases referred by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for criminal prosecution are processed before being sent to U.S. Attorneys in the field for direct action. The department has wide discretion at this point; the tax laws are so drawn that nearly all income-tax cases can be indicted as felonies, complained against as misdemeanors, or resolved entirely by civil suit.

One of Caudle's most serious difficulties in administering the work of the Tax Division was the vigorous application of statutes of limitation, which were always threatening to destroy his cases. The Department of Justice has no original jurisdiction in tax matters, and does not control the investigation phase, which is the responsibility of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury Intelligence Unit. Complicated cases — as well as some where the defense had employed delaying or pressure tactics — often failed to reach the Tax Division until a few weeks or a few days before the statutory period had run on them.

Early in his administration of the Tax Division, Caudle received through usual channels from the Bureau of Internal Revenue two related cases involving tax fraud by prominent members of the medical profession in West Virginia. The staff members whom he assigned to these cases were unanimous in recommending prosecution. As often happened when prominent individuals were involved, the division received a call from a senator. In this instance it was the senior senator from West Virginia, Harley M. Kilgore, who inquired about the status of the cases while they were in the division.¹

Thereafter, the cases were referred to the United States Attorney in West Virginia, Lee Spillers, with a request that they be presented to the grand jury. Later, to Caudle's astonishment, Spillers reported back that the grand jury had refused to indict in either. Treasury intelligence agents learned that Spillers had allowed defense witnesses to appear before the grand jury prior to the testimony of the government's witnesses. Defense witnesses, of course, have no place whatsoever in grand jury proceedings; the purpose there is to consider the government's case alone and to determine whether a crime has been charged for which a true bill of indictment is justified.

But by the time Caudle learned

of this fiasco it was too late to do anything about it; the period of limitation had run, so the cases could not be reopened and the defendants escaped prosecution.

THE same astonishing departure occurred in another case, which had been made against one Beckman, a tavern-keeper and slot-machine distributor in Oregon. This was a big case, and Beckman immediately engaged a prominent New York attorney to represent him and to attempt, through Caudle, to defeat the prosecution by an argumentative conference before the case left the department in Washington. This strategy failed. Caudle told the lawyer that he could see no valid defenses and that the file would have to go for presentation to a grand jury.

The case was sent to the U. S. Attorney in Portland, Ore., and later Caudle was advised that the grand jury had returned a "no bill." It was ascertained that here, too, the presentation had included defense witnesses, who had apparently destroyed the government's case before it was put on.

In this case, there was time to remedy the situation. Caudle sent one of his own trial lawyers all the way to Portland to appear before the same grand jury. It took him only 30 minutes to get a true bill. Beckman is now awaiting trial.

Caudle recalls a "very substantial" case, involving an understatement

¹ Caudle testified that Kilgore dropped the matter after he, Caudle, gave him all of the facts.

of income, which was prepared against a prominent businessman in North Dakota. Senator William Langer requested a conference with Caudle, at which he appeared with one of the defense attorneys. Caudle thought he managed to persuade them that there was no alternative to prosecution. Senator Langer, however, called again.

The case was forwarded to the U. S. Attorney, an indictment was returned, and the defendant was convicted and sentenced. Soon afterward, Senator Langer called once more, telling Caudle that the taxpayer's wife was now in Washington and had informed him that her husband had not been given a fair trial. The attorney who conducted the defense, she said, "had been very unwell — in fact, had been drinking." Senator Langer came to see Caudle twice thereafter, bringing with him other attorneys who were interested in the case.

Finally Caudle ordered the United States Attorney who had tried the case to fly to Washington, and another meeting was arranged. The government attorney explained that the defendant had been competently represented by more than one lawyer. The Senator was told that rumors of a "fix" were beginning to fly — and according to Caudle "that was all there was to it."

Even officials in the executive departments sometimes contacted Caudle, on behalf of friends, in

connection with tax fraud cases. David Niles, of the White House, arranged a special conference for attorney Wallace Cohen, in the malodorous Housatonic Dye Company case, impelling Caudle to make extra efforts in the case. Caudle did so, among other things sending two of his division attorneys to New York to examine directly the government's key witness. Niles was thereafter kept informed of the status of the case. Caudle said of his relations with the White House, "Yes, sir; when I am courteous, I am just really genuinely courteous." Matthew Connelly, also of the White House, obtained delays in other important cases.

IV

THE grand jury is one of the few instruments of modern society through which ordinary citizens can sometimes arm themselves with rogatory powers and plunge directly into the battle against lethargy and corruption in government. This role of grand juries is not widely understood, and ordinarily they remain tame and docile, shepherded along safe byways by the officials who minister to them. Now and then, however, there is a runaway, which produces great consternation in the official community.

One such runaway in Nashville, Tenn., indicted several persons for tax violations after the Department of Justice had decided against prosecution. This grand jury had even

returned an indictment against W. B. Massey, father-in-law of Representative Pat Sutton. Caudle and Turner Smith, his assistant, flew to Nashville at once "to block action." Caudle addressed the jury for an hour and a half. Representative Sutton also appeared that day and "took out after three or four jurors . . . and pointed his finger at them and said all the grand jury conspired to indict his father-in-law, and things got so hot I told Turner that it was time for us to go home."

Caudle and Smith disqualified themselves from further consideration of the case. Peyton Ford, acting for the Attorney General, took over, and Ellis Slack was sent to move to dismiss the indictments when they came to court.

A SERIOUS situation developed in February, 1951. Drake Watson, U. S. Attorney at St. Louis, wrote to Caudle advising that Federal Judge Moore was pressing him with respect to tax cases which the judge felt were being improperly held up. Moore had protested directly to Attorney General McGrath, and was threatening to present the cases to the grand jury himself.

The final irritant to Judge Moore seems to have been a specific instruction, teletyped from the department in Washington to Watson, telling him not to present any income-tax cases to the grand jury unless specifically directed by the depart-

ment. Judge Moore learned of this and was thoroughly provoked. He knew, also, of the deplorable conditions in the local Internal Revenue Collector's office.

Caudle responded by sending Ellis Slack to St. Louis with instructions to cooperate fully with Watson and the court, and with authority to appear before the grand jury. Long afterwards it came to light that Slack's grand jury authority had been limited to the presentation of a few named cases. Someone in the department had thus restricted him, without Caudle's knowledge. Slack, moreover, never once reported to Caudle but went over his head to Peyton Ford.

Slack came back on March 14 with a message from Judge Moore to the effect that, if Internal Revenue Collector James Finnegan would resign at once, Moore would refrain from going before the grand jury. Caudle immediately telephoned William Boyle, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, urging that "it would be a mighty wise idea for Mr. Finnegan to step down." He made similar calls to top Internal Revenue and Treasury officials. No action was taken, and on March 21 the grand jury which Moore had convened issued a partial report. Finnegan was forced to resign in April and was subsequently indicted and convicted for fraud.

On May 1, Watson wrote to Caudle (with a copy to Ford) requesting that Slack again be sent

to St. Louis to help in the preparation of the case which Judge Moore wished to have presented. This letter, though addressed to Caudle, *was never seen by him*, he says. A reply to Watson, over Caudle's signature, was dispatched on May 7. This, too, Caudle claims he never saw. It advised that Slack would return to St. Louis. Though he was directly subordinate to Caudle, the Tax Division chief knew nothing of Slack's trip until after his return. Meyer Rothwacks, another of Caudle's subordinates, confirmed the fact that it was Peyton Ford who ordered Slack to St. Louis the second time.

v

MOST of Caudle's career in Washington was closely entangled with that of Peyton Ford. Both were young men, elevated quickly to positions of responsibility in the Department of Justice, and both profited substantially from the friendship and favor of Tom Clark. Ford's prior legal experience compared unfavorably with Caudle's, in both quality and duration. He began with the department in 1946, shortly after Caudle, as a Special Assistant to Attorney General Clark. He soon moved from this post to an Assistant Attorney Generalship, in charge of the Claims Division. Then he was appointed Assistant to the Attorney General (later retitled Deputy Attorney General), an appointment which placed him

second in command to Clark, as head of the latter's personal staff.

In this position, Ford acted with the direct authority of the Attorney General himself, outranking the other assistants and superseding them at pleasure. His office also had major control over policies affecting the department's personnel.

Ford and Caudle soon came into conflict. Ford took over the files and assumed control in the Kansas City fraud case after Caudle, then head of the Criminal Division, had become intimately acquainted with the situation. And, in the St. Louis grand jury case, Ford, through Slack, usurped Caudle's authority again, and effectively excluded the latter at a critical moment.

Under the Revenue Code, and department practice, Caudle had authority to make compromises in civil tax cases involving up to \$10,000, and the Attorney General himself was authorized to compromise in cases up to \$75,000. The larger compromise proposals had always been analyzed by Caudle and then sent directly to the Attorney General through his executive assistant, Grace Stewart. In 1949, after McGrath became Attorney General, Miss Stewart came to Caudle. She was thoroughly upset because Ford had ordered that these compromise cases should no longer be routed to anyone but him. Caudle learned that Ford was also assuming many of the Attorney General's

other powers and jurisdictions.

As early as the spring of 1949, Caudle began to receive warnings that Ford was trying to have him dismissed. Congressman Sutton told him about a meeting held shortly after the 1948 elections, at which William Boyle, Matthew Connelly, and Peyton Ford had discussed patronage, and in the course of which Ford had been outspoken in urging that Caudle be dropped. He was cautioned by his associates within the department that Ford was "out to cut your throat," and that the latter had launched a campaign to "ease" him out of his post.

Following these rumors, in 1951, Burt Naster, a promoter, paroled convict from a tax charge, and dabbler in political intrigue, who was also a friend of Caudle's, telephoned and told him that his position was in grave danger. Naster urged Caudle to meet Henry Grunewald, whom he characterized as being "close to the top." But Caudle stood his ground. He refused Naster's offer to make an appointment with Grunewald.

Ford's personal actions may have reflected, in part, the policies of his superiors. But the subcommittee feels that he was not equipped to stand in the stead of the chief legal officer of the United States as freely as he did through the Clark and McGrath administrations. It was unfortunate that Ford, who resigned just before the public examination

of the department got under way, avoided the careful scrutiny which Caudle endured to the end.

VI

LAMAR CAUDLE's career in Washington was entirely embraced by the Truman administration. He was a loyal party member and a hard worker in the political campaigns. And he was blindly devoted to the President.

In July, 1951, Caudle made a trip to Italy with Carmen D'Agostino, president of the Renault Champagne Company. Just before he left, he became concerned at last over rumors of his impending dismissal. He asked D'Agostino to talk with presidential assistant Donald Dawson and to find out what his status was. Dawson, D'Agostino reported, gave unqualified assurances that Caudle's post was in no danger.

In September, 1951, President Truman flew to North Carolina to participate in a ground-breaking ceremony at Caudle's college, Wake Forest. Caudle was invited to go with the White House party. Since at this time he was under fire from all directions, he declined the invitation, fearing that the President might be embarrassed. After the invitation was extended and refused again, he received what amounted to a command from the White House to join the party. President Truman was cordial to him when they met.

Shortly after this trip, Caudle became the object of an intensive inquiry by the King subcommittee. Yet his relations with his superiors remained remarkably cordial. And the President himself was more friendly than ever. A few days after the party returned from Wake Forest, Caudle wrote President Truman a note of thanks and congratulations, and received a prompt, personal reply, dated Oct. 19, 1951:

Dear Mr. Caudle:

I can't tell you how very much I appreciate your good letter of the seventeenth. I certainly enjoyed the visit at Winston-Salem and was glad to have the opportunity to tell the world some things that needed to be said.

Men like you and Jess Larson make it possible to carry on in this job.

Sincerely yours,
Harry Truman

When Caudle and D'Agostino came home from Italy, earlier that fall, they had brought a handsome cigarette case and presented it as a joint gift to President Truman. On October 29, 1951, only three weeks before Caudle's dismissal, the President wrote to him again, acknowledging this gift and conveying his

thanks. The letter opened with the salutation, "Dear Lamar."

Moreover, on November 16, 1951, *the night before the blow fell*, Caudle relates that Donald Dawson telephoned from Key West, where President Truman was vacationing, and *again assured him (Caudle) that "everybody at the White House was 100 per cent behind me."*

The next day, in the late afternoon, Caudle was summoned to McGrath's office, and was dismissed on the spot. A few days later, the President made a public statement disavowing Caudle and asserting that he had been watching him and would have discharged him even without the public disclosures.

This is one case study, taken from the endless files of corruption during the Truman administration. A few men have gone to jail. Many more have defrauded the government of millions in income taxes — with the collusion of the Revenue Bureau and the Justice Department. No one has bothered to ask Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark to explain his part in the Amerasia case — or why the Kansas City vote theft was never fully prosecuted. This bashfulness is, in a moral sense, a crime. And crime marches on!



» No matter what theory of the origin of government you adopt, if you follow it out to its legitimate conclusions it will bring you face to face with the moral law. — J. Van Dyke

In the MERCURY'S

OPINION

THERE was a time, in the good old days, when the bleeding-heart journalist devoted his talents to the glorification of some chorus girl who had just put a slug in sugar daddy's heart — or a deserving bank clerk who had dipped into the till to support a starving wife, child, and mistress. This was all in the spirit of good, clean fun. It did little harm except to sugar daddies and bank funds.

But in recent years a new crop of bleeding hearts has invaded the Fourth Estate. Modern design and twenty years of New Deal indoctrination have lifted them from the grime of sex. Today they cover Washington, or write editorials and columns. They still gush every day at deadline, but their hearts now belong to the Communist, the fellow traveler, or the front-joining liberal who has been publicly exposed. In their ardent defense of the accused, they outdo each other in lauding him as a sterling citizen, a contributor to the March of Dimes, and an anti-Red since his diaper days.

No one, certainly, would deprive a bleeder of his constitutional right to bleed. But the double-think sob



sisters are not content to go off in what Groucho Marx called "a blizzard of horse-radish." If the facts don't fit the case they are trying to make, they too often tailor them to suit. This is a serious charge, but the documentation would fill a library.

For those who came in late, here are a few exhibits of journalistic hemophilia:

Item. The Charlotte, N. C., *News* reported editorially, and with a deep frown of doubt, that the Senate Internal Security subcommittee had described the Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers as "heavily impregnated with Communist influence." The editorial flatly said that "the subcommittee based much of its indictment [sic] on the testimony of Harvey Matusow." For close to a column, then, the *News* painted Matusow as a liar and a rogue. The implication was clear: The subcommittee had smeared a fine, patriotic union.

The facts are somewhat different. Matusow's testimony ran to less than fifteen of the 300 pages devoted to hearings on the UMMSW. Among the other witnesses were the president and secretary-treasurer of the union, both of whom pleaded self-

incrimination. The kicker, of course, is that a full two years before the hearings, the UMMSW had been expelled from the CIO for policies which were "consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party."

The Charlotte *News* editorial writer mentioned none of these facts. Instead, he sent clippings of his editorial to national publications, suggesting that they take up the cause. "Loyalty to truth," he said, was paramount.

Item. On the day that Owen Lattimore was indicted for perjury involving pro-Communist connections, Elmer Davis (in his regular ABC broadcast) undertook to rescue the little professor from that due process of law which the liberals (Davis included) had always insisted was his right. His monotone voice vibrant with emotion, Davis repeated the standard accusations of "witch hunt."

But Davis could not merely weep for Adonais; Louis Budenz, one of the many congressional witnesses against Lattimore, had to be smeared. Budenz, said Davis, had called Lattimore a Communist after first denying it. The facts were: (1) Budenz had never denied that Lattimore was a Communist; (2) Budenz did not figure in the five counts of perjury handed up by the grand jury; therefore the attack was gratuitous; and (3) by Davis' own standard, set up when he ran the

Office of War Information, Lattimore was at best a fellow traveler.

That standard bears describing, because Davis in recent years seems to have forgotten it. It was Davis' dictum that any man who followed the party line by opposing aid to Britain during the days of the Hitler-Stalin Pact, and then switched when the Soviet Union was invaded, could be presumed a fellow traveler or a Communist. And Lattimore, during the pact, attacked the U.S. as the "arsenal of aggression," at a meeting of the Communist-front China Aid Council; and then switched to enthusiastic interventionism when Russia needed American guns and tanks.

Item. The case of Joseph Alsop, whose column has a "conservative" imprimatur. For the last year or so, Alsop has taken to bleeding over the same Far Eastern experts of the State Department whom he once attacked. To this end, he wrote several columns, in effect accusing Robert Morris, counsel for the Senate Internal Security subcommittee, of leading witnesses into perjury. Under oath, however, Alsop subsequently withdrew the charge. But, once off the witness stand, Alsop rushed back to his journalistic blood bank to give several more pints. For the *Atlantic Monthly*, he wrote a piece which deprecated Lattimore's "unfortunate habit of being silly about Far Eastern politics" — a "silliness" which led straight to Korea — but steamed with misin-

formation, innuendoes, and downright falsehoods about anti-Communists. In one classic sentence, he wrote:

"[Robert Morris] was the original link between [Senator] McCarthy and the mysterious J. E. Farrand, paymaster of the Negro ex-Communist forger whom McCarthy hired to spy on John Carter Vincent's doings as American Minister to Switzerland."

It is true that Vincent was the American Minister and that the "forger," Charles Davis, was a Negro. All the rest is fiction. There is nothing mysterious about Farrand; he was not a paymaster; McCarthy did not hire Davis to spy on Vincent; and Davis turned on McCarthy and Farrand because they would have nothing to do with him. Davis, moreover, was so much an "ex-Communist" that he wrote a series of articles for the pro-Communist New York *Compass* in which he claimed that he was not only a McCarthy "spy" but an FBI man and a State Department investigator — all rolled into one.

These are three exhibits, taken

virtually at random. They are the product of the heirs of newspapermen who made Tommy Manville a national figure and put gangsters' molls in a hurdy-gurdy pantheon. But nobody took the old boys seriously. Today's deadline bleeders, however, have "causes" and command serious audiences; they poison the wells of public policy.

They are bleeding hearts with a difference, for they have come to believe their own copy. What they need is a tight tourniquet.

Or, to express it another way, what they really need is to follow some of that good advice they are so fond of giving to journalism students and cub reporters. To get off of their big broad duffs; to wear out a little shoe leather chasing down facts; to check, double check, and then re-check their "facts" again; and, last and most important, to stick to those facts when they sit down to their typewriters, or clutch their microphones in their sweaty little hands. Bleed all you want, boys and girls, but first make reasonably sure of to whom and for what, you are giving your precious drops of blood.



» In Boston they ask, How much does he know? In New York, How much is he worth? In Philadelphia, Who were his parents?

— Mark Twain



» Very late in life, when he was studying geometry, some one said to Lacydes, "Is it then a time for you to be learning now?"

"If it is not," he replied, "when will it be?"

— Diogenes Laertius



Robert Morris

BY HOWARD RUSHMORE



OUTSIDE Admiral Chester W. Nimitz's office, the Honolulu sun was shining with tropical brilliance but a young, apple-cheeked Navy lieutenant standing at rigid attention shivered and tried to quell the knocking of his knees.

It wasn't exactly a court-martial, but the seven admirals seated around the table bent a gimlet glare on the lieutenant and waited.

"Start talking, Mr. Morris," Admiral Nimitz said.

So Robert Morris, four years out of Fordham law school and convinced at this particular moment that he also might be out on a limb, started talking.

He had been given twenty minutes for the interview he had requested. As he talked the admirals leaned forward, their interest growing as the junior officer related in a clear but quiet voice how the Joint Intelligence Center of Pacific files and library were packed with pro-Communist literature written by

such authors as Owen Lattimore.

Morris stopped at the end of his twenty minutes. "Go on," the admirals said.

And when he had finished, half an hour later, the admirals arose from the council table sadder but wiser men. Morris made them realize that a more formidable enemy than the Japanese was staging a political Pearl Harbor and was doing it with the blessings of official Washington.

That incident in a way is rather typical of Bob Morris' career as an anti-Communist lawyer who for the past thirteen years has battled his nation's enemies with little regard to his personal welfare or advancement.

Morris faced the admirals that day because he was alarmed over the preponderance of Red literature stored in the Navy's Intelligence Headquarters, warfare division, and he had violated all rules of channel command by writing a note directed to Nimitz requesting the interview. It was not a method calculated to

add another half-stripe to his sleeve.

Back in 1940 he also was warned that he was handling political dynamite when he joined the staff of a New York State legislative committee probing Communist teachers. Again, ten years later, he violated proper rules of political behavior when he became counsel to the Republic minority of the Tydings Senate subcommittee and stood up in those dreary days of the GOP, to be counted among Joe McCarthy's friends.

THE tall, blue-eyed Morris is a rather remarkable young American in that he grew up a Republican and remained one through the siren calls of the New Deal and the defections of so many intellectuals of his generation to socialism, atheism, and the Young Communist League. His first vote went to Alfred Landon and he has voted the straight Republican ticket ever since. Although he almost never discusses his religion, Morris' deep belief in his faith has brought him to an understanding of the problems of the many ex-Communists with whom he has dealt.

"Bob isn't a cynical person," one of these former Reds said recently. "He has a really deep compassion for the convert, particularly the Communist who comes to an understanding of the error of his ways. You can talk to him and know you are dealing with an honest man."

Morris refuses to regard the aver-

age ex-Communist as just another witness to be used on the stand to gain a conviction or to give necessary testimony. They are human beings, he argues, and at least two former Communists, won over by Morris' understanding of their problems, took a public stand against the fifth column largely as a result of Bob's handling of their personal situations.

One of these was William Martin Canning, born and reared a Catholic, who drifted away from his faith and into the Communist Party while a professor at City College. Morris' assignment on the legislative committee back in 1940 was gathering the evidence and that had to come mainly from ex-Communists. Morris' first meeting with Canning wasn't productive. The professor had heard so many stories from the comrades about stool pigeons and what the party did to them that he was reluctant to cooperate. It took all Bob's patience and calm, clear logic to convince Canning to take the mental and physical step away from the ranks of treason. When he took the stand he named 55 Communists, most of whom were later fired. Canning then returned to the Catholic Church and he and Morris are close personal friends to this day.

DURING these hearings, Morris met another Communist who later became another ace witness. But, at the time, Dr. Bella V. Dodd hated Morris, the committee and

such "renegades" as Canning. A former Hunter College professor, Dr. Dodd became a Communist enthusiast during the depression and was "commissar" of the Red-controlled Teachers Union when the committee investigation opened.

Morris ran up against her sharp tongue and devastating oratory several times during the inquiry. In those years the Communists were able to hire such swanky forums as Carnegie Hall to lure the liberals and pinkos into denunciation of the investigation.

"Looking back on that period of my life, I know now I have a lot to apologize for," she told Morris 12 years later. "And particularly, to you."

It was Morris who played a major role in getting Dr. Dodd to take the stand before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee last fall in New York City. The intense little dark-eyed woman had been reluctant to be a witness, but Morris persuaded her, and her testimony was a real blow to Reds in education.

His first anti-Communist job also won Morris another lifelong friend. In 1939, Bob was a law clerk at \$125 a month and he had made the rounds of many legal offices looking for a better job. Early in 1940 State Senator Frederick Coudert, Jr., had set up the committee to probe Communist teachers, and his chief counsel, Paul Windels, went looking for talent. Bright young

Republican lawyers, willing to accept jobs at modest salaries, weren't easy to find and Morris landed with the committee mainly because his name was on file in one corporation as a "prospect." He was interviewed and took the job. And then he met the state legislator. Coudert, now a Congressman who is rapidly rising in the Republican ranks, and Morris have made an impressive team throughout the years and Bob still acts as Coudert's New York representative when the latter is in Washington.

After the committee had finished its work in 1941 and issued its report, which is still a model for anti-Communist investigating agencies, Naval Intelligence grabbed Morris on the strength of warm recommendations from Coudert and Windels.

Although merely an ensign, Morris was put in charge of the Communist-Soviet Desk of Counterintelligence for the Third Naval District. He soon had an active unit and a growing file and within six months his department was a veritable mine of information for other intelligence services.

He still likes to repeat the story of a visiting Army Intelligence officer who, after leaving his office, wandered through the room where officers and yeomen were pouring over Communist publications to extract pertinent information.

The Army lad called excitedly on the phone from downstairs.

"Look, Morris," he said, "you've

got a Commie right in your own department."

"How do you know?"

"I saw him reading the *Daily Worker*."

Morris explained why it was necessary for his staff to read the enemy's propaganda, but he thinks to this day that the Army officer still views Naval Intelligence with suspicion.

ONE of his staff did turn out to be a Communist, but by intent. The Navy learned that Communists within the CIO's National Maritime Union had set up an intelligence service of their own and were grilling all Red seamen daily about shipments all over the world. So Morris sent one of his best officers into the Communist Party with orders to get a line on Red espionage. This officer became an invaluable operative and was soon supplying accurate reports on secret operations of the Communists on the waterfront.

One of his reports dealt with Russia's diversion of military equipment being supplied by the U. S. from the immediate battle areas to supply depots in the Urals for postwar use.

Navy Intelligence considered this report so important that it was rushed to Washington, where it was sent to the State Department and the White House. A few days later startling orders came through channels to Morris and his intelligence group. The unit was to be broken up, immediately.

"I know the Navy opposed this," Morris recalls. "The orders came from higher up. But it was a blow to all of us who had worked hard to build up this unit. We knew how the Communists had penetrated the maritime industry and the armed forces, and there were too few units such as ours to combat them."

Even the Navy officer in the invaluable spot as an undercover agent within the Communist Party was ordered to drop this work. All officers in Morris' unit were sent on widely different assignments, none of them dealing with Communism.

Although Morris still will not discuss the incident in detail, it is obvious that the Communists with access to the White House in 1941-42 learned of Morris' counterspy and put on political pressure. Their reward was the destruction of one of the Navy's best anti-Communist units.

MORRIS was ordered to proceed immediately to Admiral Nimitz's fleet headquarters. He was placed in charge of the Advance Psychological Warfare Section and helped work out the strategy for persuading the Japanese to surrender. In this work Morris came across the "recommended" literature for use by his section and immediately spotted the works of authors he knew to be pro-Communist. These names later were to become public in the Institute of Pacific Relations hearings, but in 1944 these same

writers were being hailed as great diplomats in the pages of the New York Times book review section.

This resulted in Bob's impetuous note to Admiral Nimitz and the hearing before the high brass. And Morris then began a serious study of the works of Owen Lattimore and noted the Far Eastern expert's warm sympathy for the Red Chinese "agrarians" and his advocacy of a "tough" peace for Japan. Seven years later Morris remembered those Honolulu studies when he confronted Lattimore in a Senate hearing room.

After the war, Morris came back to the mainland a lieutenant commander and upon his discharge went into private practice. He helped found the firm of Hochwald, Morris and Richmond and is still a member of the firm. But his concern over Communism had not abated and while working in various Republican campaigns, particularly those for the re-election of his friend Coudert, Morris kept urging the GOP to awaken to the situation in China and concentrate on exposing the connivance of the State Department, Lattimore, John Service, John Carter Vincent and the official advocates of "Chinese Red agrarians."

THE return of Morris to the anti-Communist arena came in 1950 when Senator Joseph McCarthy attacked the State Department and named some of the pro-Reds who were giving aid and comfort to Red China and who were urging that all

aid be withdrawn from Chiang Kai-Shek. The Truman administration set up the subcommittee under the direction of Senator Millard Tydings and leveled its guns on McCarthy. Many a politico, sensing the possibility of a successful smear of the Wisconsin Senator, ducked out of this one, but not Morris. When the Republican minority on the subcommittee offered him the job as counsel, Morris grabbed it immediately.

It was a thankless job. Tydings and the Democrats were determined to discredit McCarthy's charges and they tried to brush aside the brash young Republican lawyer who demanded such privileges as cross-examination and the right to produce witnesses.

"My first day on the job was in the hearing room," Morris recalls. "The Democrats didn't even give me a chair and I had to find a box and sit on it at the counsel table."

He was boxed in otherwise throughout the subcommittee's existence. When the Republican minority, with Morris doing the detail work, lined up 30 witnesses to refute the testimony of such witnesses as Lattimore and Earl Browder, the following exchange occurred:

MORRIS: "There is the case of a man named Theodore Geiger [one of those named by McCarthy]. He has been an employee of the State Department. He is now one of Paul Hoffman's top assistants. He is doing work that is quasi-State Department

in character. I have some witnesses who will testify that he was a member of the same Communist Party unit as they were, and I think we would be delinquent if, in the face of this evidence, that is now in the record . . .”

SEN. TYDINGS: “Turn it over to the FBI or do something else with it . . . we don’t want to waste this afternoon.”

This example is cited to prove that Morris was prepared to produce evidence to substantiate McCarthy’s charges — and the evidence was refused. The final Tydings report whitewashed the State Department, “cleared” Lattimore of McCarthy’s charge that the latter was a Soviet espionage agent, and branded McCarthy a liar.

Although the people of Maryland turned Tydings out of office that fall, the summer soldiers of the Republican Party were frightened by the smear job done on Joe McCarthy and started avoiding the ex-Marine who had stood by his guns. Morris did not run; he and McCarthy became close friends and Morris is not in the habit of deserting friends.

A FEW months after the Tydings whitewash had dried, an investigator for McCarthy was tipped off that more than 200,000 documents of the Institute of Pacific Relations were stored in a barn near Lee, Massachusetts.

During the Tydings hearings,

Morris had urged that the IPR be investigated. The Republican lawyer knew that this world-wide research organization had played a major role in shaping State Department policy on the Far East, and Morris suspected that the IPR concealed many a Communist who helped shape the group into a powerful front for Stalin.

In 1951 Morris was named special counsel to the Senate Internal Security subcommittee. He subpoenaed 200,000 IPR papers, and with the aid of Benjamin Mandel, research director of the subcommittee, spent weeks studying them.

The pattern began forming in the words and writings of Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Lattimore, Lauchlin Currie, Vincent, Service, Edward Carter, Philip Jessup and other persons connected with the IPR. Then Morris called Lattimore and other witnesses into executive session.

Morris took this testimony, compared it with the documents, and the rest is history. More than 80 staff members or writers for IPR were named as Communists in public hearings. The role of the traitor Alger Hiss and many like him was documented. Under Morris’ grilling, Lattimore spent 12 days on the witness stand. He strode into the hearing-room the first day surrounded by a battery of New Deal lawyers and left-wing correspondents who had read and believed Lattimore’s book, *Ordeal by Slander*.

AT FIRST glance, Morris is deceptive. He looks about ten years under his actual age of 38 and his manner of examination is plodding and deliberate rather than brilliant. But at the end of 12 days on the stand, Lattimore found that the disarming young man in the Brooks Brothers suit was a tormentor whose mind was a card-index file and whose examination hurt and hurt and hurt. And Lattimore was hurt, even in the eyes of those who had believed his innocence when McCarthy made the initial charge.

The effect of Morris' steady, persistent questioning on Lattimore's poise was illustrated by the following exchange:

MORRIS: "Did you ever give military secrets to the Soviet Union?"

LATTIMORE: "No, *unless you can show me a document* to refresh my recollection."

The final report on the IPR, and particularly Lattimore, said of the State Department consultant: "Lattimore was a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

The report concluded: "The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American Far Eastern policies toward Communist objectives."

The subcommittee also recommended that the Justice Department study Lattimore's testimony for possible perjury. Six months later Roy M. Cohn, special assistant U. S. Attorney General, presented

the case before a grand jury and Lattimore was indicted on seven counts of perjury.

Even during the height of the election campaign last fall, Morris was able to persuade busy Senators to come to New York City for a series of hearings on Communist teachers and infiltration of American Communists into the United States.

Working without a single investigator and aided only by Mandel, Morris worked around the clock lining up evidence. A dozen teachers were fired as a result of their refusal to answer whether or not they were Communists. And a score of UN Reds were either fired or resigned as a result of the investigation.

The UN probe was another battle. Morris met resistance both from the State Department and from the pompous officialdom of the world organization.

But Morris, as always, ignored the opposition and kept plugging away. Newspapers such as the New York Times and the New York Post took a dim view of Morris' work. But they quickly retreated when one after another of the subpoenaed UN officials refused to state whether or not they were Communists.

Even the most stalwart of the professional "liberals" had no comment after Morris interrogated Frank Coe, the \$20,000-a-year secretary of the International Mone-

tary Fund. Coe not only refused to answer the usual questions about Communism, but flatly said he would not tell the Senate subcommittee whether he was engaged in espionage against the United States government.

This same Coe had been named by Elizabeth Bentley in 1948 as part of a Soviet spy ring, but he had gone on to bigger and better jobs with official Washington's blessing. The Fund finally fired him after Morris' interrogation made page one headlines across the country.

AT THE age of 38, Morris has made a reputation for himself and could, if he wished, retire to private practice and start building a bank account. But he intends to continue his work in the Senate, pursuing America's enemies until

they have been chased out of government and from other sensitive positions.

He isn't complacent about the future. He knows that the Communists never quit and that having a Republican Congress, with President Eisenhower in the White House, is not an absolute guarantee of internal security.

His wife, Joan, a former newspaper woman whom Bob married between Senate hearings, has adapted herself to being the wife of a man who spends his days gathering evidence and most of his nights on the telephone talking with Senators and prospective witnesses.

"A man has to have a cause," she says, practically. "And Bob has a good one. Probably he'll never do anything else, but that's his life and I'm all for it."



» We must learn that any person who will not accept what he knows to be truth, for the very love of truth alone, is very definitely undermining his mental integrity. It will be observed that the mind of such a person gradually stops growing, for, being constantly hedged in and cropped here and there, it soon learns to respect artificial fences more than freedom for growth.

You have not been a very close observer of such men if you have not seen them shrivel, become commonplace, mean, without influence, without friends and without the enthusiasm of youth and growth, like a tree covered with fungus, the foliage diseased, the life gone out of the heart with dry rot, and indelibly marked for destruction — dead, but not yet handed over to the undertaker.

— *Luther Burbank*

DANGERS, DILEMMAS *and* DULLES

By PATRICK McMAHON



NOR since John Jay took the oath of office as the first Secretary of State of the newborn United States of America, has this nation been confronted with such an intricacy of foreign problems as those now being taken on by John Foster Dulles.

The situations faced by Jay and Dulles are comparable only in their seriousness. Secretary Dulles must realize, as did Secretary Jay more than a century and a half ago, that the very destiny of the nation hangs upon his day-to-day decisions. A single false move can bring irreparable damage, possibly disaster.

Jay's greatest handicap was that he had to play from weakness. The infant republic was a military and economic weakling in a world dominated by hostile, land-hungry, imperialistic powers, all of them fanatically wedded to the principle of the Divine Right of Kings—a political dogma which had been so boldly challenged by this fledgling upstart in the New World in a heresy that was soon to spread to France. Jay's foreign problems were further complicated by powerful political factions in each state, which

opposed a strong federal government, and deeply resented the surrender by the states, to the federal government, of their sovereign rights in the field of foreign policy.

His two great assets were the formidable barrier which the Atlantic Ocean presented to a would-be European aggressor, and the fact that the European powers themselves were split into warring factions which were quite evenly balanced in power.

The policy he evolved, and which his successors followed, was based on the avoidance of any involvement, direct or indirect, in the struggles between the European nations, and, by exploiting to their fullest the arts of diplomatic adroitness and persuasiveness, convincing the foreign rulers that they could not take the risk of diverting from home the substantial military and naval strength necessary for imperialistic adventures in America.

The policy of Jay and Washington purchased 15 years of peace, during which the 13 weak and divided colonies were welded into a nation strong enough to stand off the British in the War of 1812. And

for another century we avoided clashing with a major power by holding aloof from European quarrels.

As Mr. Dulles takes over the direction of foreign policy, however, he faces a radically changed situation. The policy of Jay and Washington was abandoned by Woodrow Wilson during the first World War — and again abandoned a generation later by Roosevelt, Hopkins and Hull, by Truman, Stettinius, Byrnes, Marshall and Acheson. This time abandoned so completely it is doubtful that it could ever be restored — at least during the lifetimes of living Americans.

Today we are not only embroiled to the hilt in the quarrels of Europe; we are bound in a dozen treaties with more than two-score nations scattered all around the globe — in the Middle East, the Far East, in Latin America, in Australasia and the Pacific Islands. We have pledged our honor, our blood and our fortunes, all of our economic and military resources, to defend their political and territorial integrity from the most ruthless, grimly determined, imperialistic force in the History of Man.

Whereas Jay had the supreme advantage of a divided enemy, the opponents faced by Dulles are tightly knit into a Communist bloc, with each member government blindly responsive to the will of the Kremlin. It is among our allies,

not the enemy, that Secretary Dulles finds division and discord, deep-seated hatreds and grievances, sharp conflicts of interests and aspirations.

Even more serious is the widening rift between our allies — singly and collectively — and ourselves; a rift which is extending into every phase of international affairs, which has already seriously impaired the effectiveness of our entire foreign policy, and which will certainly destroy it completely — at least in its present shape — unless the trend is quickly reversed. The rift is manifest not only in the growing opposition of governments to United States policy; it is even more evident in the alarming growth of anti-American sentiment among the “friendly” foreign peoples. Today we are undoubtedly the most hated nation in the non-Communist world. Tomorrow, if the present drift continues, we have an excellent chance of displacing the Soviet Union as Public Enemy No. 1 in world opinion.

THESE rifts among our allies, and between our allies and ourselves, must be quickly resolved by Mr. Dulles before they plunge us all into disaster. Or else he must evolve an entirely new approach to the Soviet menace — an approach based on unilateral policy, unilateral objectives and unilateral action.

However, any such change in foreign policy has been firmly rejected by both President Eisen-

hower and Secretary Dulles. They have reaffirmed their faith in a united front of non-Communist nations, working through the NATO and similar military and economic alliances; they have reaffirmed their faith in the United Nations as the principal vehicle by which world peace may eventually be reached.

So on the sagging, elderly shoulders of John Foster Dulles falls the almost superhuman burden of uniting the non-Communist world into an effective coalition, in which each member nation — frequently at great sacrifice — is willing to subordinate its own nationalistic interests to the common objective. That, of course, applies to ourselves, and, while we certainly cannot be accused of shirking sacrifice thus far, the American public is becoming very, very weary.

To achieve such a coalition, Mr. Dulles must first find the answers to as perplexing a set of dilemmas, paradoxes, enigmas and plain ordinary riddles, as ever have plagued a statesman.

HIGH UP on the list, if not at the very top, is the paradox propounded by President Eisenhower and affirmed by Dulles, himself, in rejecting as “inadequate” and “defeatist” the Truman-Acheson policy of containment. In one of the few departures from the foreign policies of their predecessors, the new President and his Secretary of State announced their intention

of adopting a program to liberate, by “peaceful” means, the slave nations behind the Iron Curtain. Although the details of the program are yet to be revealed, the objective, itself, would seem to contain a contradiction. It is true that *ineffective* programs to stir up unrest and aid subversive elements in the Soviet sphere have already been undertaken, and could undoubtedly be extended without plunging the world into full-scale atomic war — as long as they continue to be *ineffective*.

However, any such program that shows promise of becoming *effective*, which might, in time, accomplish the objective of liberating the Soviet satellites, must in itself increase the *risk* of war. It is doubtful that the Soviet leaders will again be caught napping as they were by Tito in Yugoslavia (and there is considerable question whether the people of Yugoslavia have yet attained *liberation*). It is doubtful that they would hesitate to embark on the disastrous adventure of atomic war, if they felt it necessary to avert attention from internal troubles. It is even doubtful that any subversive scheme can approximate the scope and organization essential to success, before it is detected and ruthlessly stamped out by the secret police and — if necessary — the Red Army.

It is equally doubtful that we ourselves could sit idly by and watch the slaughter of hundreds of thou-

sands of people, and carry in our conscience the knowledge that their deaths and tortures were the direct result of their response to our bidding.

There is, of course, the possibility of an internal collapse behind the Iron Curtain resulting from a split within the Kremlin itself, with different individuals and factions vying for power after the death of Stalin. Such a split, however, if it comes at all, will be the direct result of the lust for power of the surviving Communist leaders, and not from any outside influence. Such a split, if it is to achieve the objectives we desire, must extend through all ranks of the Red Army, and possibly the secret police as well. For once the iron discipline of the Kremlin collapsed under discord, a united Red Army would rule Russia, and name the new dictator.

It is not the purpose of this article to challenge either the essentiality or the desirability of the Eisenhower-Dulles "liberation" objective. It is solely to point out that it would be both foolhardy and dishonest to attempt to disguise the dangers manifest in such a policy.

And in recognizing the dangers, Dulles' paradox becomes Dulles' dilemma. For not a single major ally (unless you would regard Nationalist China as "major") is willing to support any policy that is likely to enhance the dangers of all-out war.

Our allies in the United Nations are adamant against any action in Korea that is likely to achieve a decision. And decisive action in Korea is another Eisenhower-Dulles pledge, and another dilemma for Mr. Dulles to resolve. His predicament is to unite the allied countries into a firm coalition, and at the same time effect policies that the governments and publics of virtually every other country are firmly convinced spell only disaster. He must either abandon his objectives, or convince our friends, and neither is going to be an easy task.

And in every quarter of the free world, in every area of national and international affairs, Secretary Dulles is faced with a series of equally awkward problems which must be resolved before a strong, workable coalition can be effected.

In Western Europe there is the primary problem of unification. Every European statesman agrees in principle that a substantial degree of economic, military and political unification is necessary to survival. They agree that the alternatives are continued dependence upon U. S. protection and economic largess, continued low living standards, continued vulnerability to Soviet aggression — and very probably, the eventual extinction of their civilization. Those things they agree to, in principle. And in practice, the Western European statesmen and publics alike seem equally agreed that the slightest infringement of

their national sovereignty is just as abhorrent as the inevitable results of continued disunity.

CLOSELY involved in the unification problem is the Franco-German paradox. If France is to be appeased — and France is the key to Western European unity — Germany must be kept so weak that she will never again become a threat to French security. Yet, if the over-all objective is to be attained, Germany must be made sufficiently strong to bear the major burden of withstanding a sudden thrust by the Red Armies, which in a matter of weeks could hurl 100 to 150 divisions across the Polish-German frontier.

Equally involved in the unification problem is the British dilemma. Britain is reluctant to participate in European military or economic unification schemes, because she fears it would weaken her control over the British Commonwealths. At the same time she is unwilling to remain entirely on the outside, because she fears that a strong continental coalition would soon surpass Britain in economic, military, and political strength, and the United Kingdom would gradually sink from the status of a second-rate to a third-rate power. So the British seek a dominant voice in continental unification proposals, without participating, or sharing the responsibility and risk. To which the French, Germans, and Italians quite naturally object.

Inextricably linked with these problems is the threatened collapse of NATO, into which we are pouring billions of dollars in military and economic support, while the European NATO countries are whittling away their commitments and scuttling plans. Unless Secretary Dulles is able to persuade the British and other European governments to spend more for defense, and possibly less for social welfare, he is certain to encounter increasing difficulty in pushing multi-billion-dollar foreign aid programs through Congress.

Turning to North Africa and the Middle East, Mr. Dulles must find a way to eliminate the violent clash between the nationalistic aspirations of the Moslem countries, and the imperialist dreams that are still nursed in that area by the British and French (not to mention the imperialistic programs and plans of the U. S.-supported state of Israel). In no other area of the world is the dilemma of Mr. Dulles more clear-cut — and dangerous — than in this one. The situation has been permitted to deteriorate so far that it is extremely doubtful that any compromise acceptable to both sides can now be worked out. Dulles must either give all-out support to the British and French, including troops and planes and battleships, or he must tell them politely but firmly to get out, and then concentrate on a quick build-up of Iran and the Arab states, possibly into some sort of a Moslem

coalition. The first alternative would certainly enrage the Moslem world and greatly increase Soviet prestige in the entire area; the second would equally enrage the British and French, although their ire might be slightly appeased if the protection of their remaining economic interests can be negotiated.

A SIMILAR explosive situation is developing in the Far East, where Winston Churchill, in a maneuver to restore British prestige and insure the retention of Hong Kong and Malaya, is seeking U. S. support for a Southeast Asia "security" alliance, which would be securely under the domination of the Western and British Commonwealth powers. The members proposed by Churchill would be the United Kingdom, France, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand and the United States.

The Churchillian plan evoked immediate protests of every Asiatic nation, from India and Pakistan to Japan and the Philippines. The one issue on which all of Asia — even including Red China — appears united, is opposition to Western domination (Chiang Kai-shek was even more insistent on the return of Hong Kong, when his Nationalist government was in control, than is Mao Tse Tung, who could have it for the taking).

In facing up to the situations in the Middle and Far East, Dulles must recognize that any policy

which we adopt that weakens French and British prestige, will not only strain our diplomatic relations with those two countries but is also certain to aggravate — at least temporarily — their already critical economic difficulties. And we have already poured out billions in a thus far fruitless effort to strengthen the French and British economies.

In Latin America, right next door, Dulles faces another set of problems. Although not as immediately urgent as those in Europe, the Middle and the Far East, these may in the long run be even more important. Throughout the entire area Communist activities are being stepped up, anti-Yanqui sentiment is increasing among all classes, U. S. investors are being subjected to continual harassment, and our sources of supply for numerous vital raw materials are being threatened. In Guatemala, the government is virtually dominated by avowed Communists, and is openly responsive to the direction of Moscow. And herein is another of Dulles' many dilemmas. If the Communists are permitted to continue control of this strategic Central American republic, it constitutes a serious threat to the security of the United States and the entire hemisphere. On the other hand, the feeling throughout Latin America against outside intervention in domestic affairs (particularly from the U. S.) is so deep-seated, that any direct action by our government in Guatemala

would almost certainly cause serious repercussions.

THE difficulties of Mr. Dulles are all the more complicated by the fact that even if he finds the answers to all of these complex problems in the specific fields of foreign policy, there is very little he can do about them until he corrects two very serious deficiencies in the application of policy that confounded the efforts of Acheson and his predecessors.

He must build up here at home a genuine respect in Congress and among the American public for the Department of State and the U. S. Foreign Service. And he must create among all segments of public opinion, and among both political parties, a solid support for the basic foreign policies he intends to pursue.

And abroad, he must build up among peoples and governments respect for and confidence in U. S. leadership in the long-range fight against Red imperialism.

Until he and his department can command the respect and solid support of their own people, he can hardly expect the confidence of foreign nations. And unless he can command the respect of the foreign governments and peoples, he can hardly make appreciable headway in inducing them to undertake radical and risky departures from their traditional political and economic policies both at home and abroad.

The embittered former Secretary of State and his zealous followers blame all of his foreign-policy failures, and particularly the failure to obtain the respect and support of the U. S. public, on Senator Joe McCarthy.

Nothing could be further from the facts. The failures of Acheson, Marshall, Byrnes and Stettinius in the all-important field of public opinion, can be attributed directly, and solely, to Messrs. Acheson, Marshall, Byrnes and Stettinius. Each in his own way flagrantly disregarded the fundamental principles of sound public relations. It was not "McCarthyism" that created distrust and opposition to the Department of State and its policies; it was the widespread distrust that created "McCarthyism." Senator McCarthy simply gave vigorous voice to the views of a substantial and already outraged segment of the American people.

THE errors of Acheson and his predecessors in the sphere of public and congressional relations are too numerous to list here. Some of the more important ones — errors which Dulles must avoid — were:

1. They retained in important posts, from motives that can only be speculated upon, officials who had been clearly established as poor security risks, at the best, and outright traitors, at the worst

2. They persisted in policies long after they had been proven unsound,

rather than admit they had made a mistake, at a time when foreign relations were so complex that serious errors were inevitable. The public was, and still is, fully aware of the difficulties involved. While a frank admission of error will always bring down the criticism of opponents, it is likely to evoke an even greater volume of approval from the impartial. But Acheson and his predecessors chose to cover up, to twist and distort facts, to compound blunder with new blunder — and the inevitable result was increasing suspicion on all sides.

3. They made the fatal error of bombarding Congress and the public with intensive propaganda barrages, in an effort to obtain the necessary legislative support for foreign policy proposals, instead of relying upon straightforward, logical presentations of fact. The propaganda was deliberately designed to mislead; it was based on exaggeration, distortion, omission and frequently on outright misstatements of fact. For instance, in 1946 Congress was asked to approve a loan of \$3.5 billion to Britain, and to increase the loaning authority of the Export-Import Bank by \$2 billion, for loans to France and other continental countries. In presenting these requests Acheson, then Under Secretary of State, and other top administration officials told Congress and the public that the loans would put Britain and Western Europe on a strong, self-supporting eco-

nomic basis; would make them bastions of strength against Soviet encroachment; would result in the elimination of trade barriers, and would lay the foundation for profitable trade with Europe. Yet at the very time the British loan was being debated in Congress, State Department planners were working on a \$25 billion "loan" and gift program (later to be known as the Marshall Plan) which they knew would be necessary when the British loan was dissipated. And while the Marshall Plan was being discussed in congressional committees, the department's economic experts were working on a second Marshall Plan to submit to the Hill when the first Marshall Plan ended (and that one is now known as the Mutual Security Program). After the Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco Conferences, the public was literally deluged with propaganda, almost delirious in nature, presenting the United Nations as the machinery that would settle all international conflicts, and eliminate war for all time. And every informed officer in the Department of State knew, and admitted privately, that the very most that could be expected of the new organization was the settlement of disputes between minor nations, and the provision of a forum from which the major powers could debate their differences, and propagandize their views. The worst aspect of the State Department's propaganda was that it was not only dishonest

in its conception, but that its mendacities were such that they were, sooner or later, certain to be disclosed to the public.

4. They followed the practice of "leaking" information on new policies and diplomatic negotiations to friendly newspapers and reporters, who could be counted on to give them the most favorable interpretations. Thus they not only aroused the wrath of the opposition press, but also antagonized the great majority of correspondents who sought only to do an honest, objective job.

5. It was Dean Gooderham Acheson, himself, not Senator McCarthy, who introduced into our foreign policy debates the techniques he now refers to as "McCarthyism," and "smear tactics." As far back as the Lend-Lease discussions, and continued on through the hearings of the various foreign-aid programs and tariff bills, Acheson sought to silence the opposition by branding it as "isolationist," sometimes with a broad inference of "pro-Fascist," or "pro-Nazi." Even the most amateurish public relations expert (and "amateurish public relations expert" is not a contradiction in Washington) could have told him that his resort to smear tactics against the opposition was not only inviting but justifying retaliation in kind.

6. The department has frequently resorted to "pressure" tactics of the baldest type, in efforts to whip Congress into line, particu-

larly on appropriation measures. It held periodic "confidential" foreign policy forums, to which the representatives of labor unions, business organizations, farm, veterans and civic groups were invited (these representatives were usually referred to by State Department cynics as the "do-gooders"). Leading department officials gave extremely able and interesting presentations of the problems and policies in various critical areas. And while the presentations were always slanted sharply in favor of the department, the more realistic representatives in the audience recognized the fact, and discounted the effects. However, somewhere along the line, one of the more eloquent officials invariably would describe the department's difficulties with a recalcitrant Congress, particularly their difficulties in extracting tax dollars in the desired quantities. And at the conclusion of this phase of the presentation either the official himself, or a stooge planted in the audience, would invariably suggest that these difficulties would be quickly overcome, "if you good people, if you *right-thinking* people, can prevail upon your members to write or telegraph their Senators and Congressmen, and let them know your views." It was a tactic that won few friends among the "do-gooders," and many enemies on Capitol Hill.

7. They frequently used the cloak of "security" to shield from the public view developments which

were simply embarrassing politically, and contained no security element whatsoever. The State Department's public relations will always be complicated by the necessity of conducting certain operations and negotiations in absolute secrecy, lest their success be jeopardized. Which makes it all the more important that the withholding of pertinent information be kept at an absolute minimum, and the label of "security" be never abused.

Of course, the best public relations program conceivable by man will hardly build up public respect and support, unless Mr. Dulles' policies are such that the people can understand and support. Nevertheless, no matter how sound his policies may be, it is equally true that they are likely to meet only frustration, unless his public relations are also sound.

IN EXERTING U. S. leadership abroad, Mr. Dulles must first solve the enigma of a Western Europe that has repeatedly, and in desperation, urged us to accept the leader's role, but has consistently refused to follow in the direction we sought to lead. There is a growing suspicion in Congress that the answer to this is that Western Europe did not really want us to lead at all; they simply wanted us to reach for the chit.

However, this interpretation may not be altogether fair. For we matched the European paradox with

one of our own. The U. S. government, as Acheson so frequently and eloquently expressed it, "reluctantly accepted the mantle of leadership which the free world has thrust upon us"; and then hesitated to lead. In our relations with the European Marshall Plan organization (OEEC), with the NATO, and in our individual relations with the member governments, our diplomats took the role of advisers, not leaders. We gave counsel and exercised tact and patience, when the situation called for direction, firmness and action. Never before in history has a great power been so sensitive of the sovereignty of others, and less conscious of its own sovereign rights. We have permitted our allies to ignore flagrantly the commitments they have made under the Marshall Plan, the NATO, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements, the United Nations, and various other pacts, often on the ground that insistence upon their compliance would somehow infringe their sovereign rights. The facts were that the nations involved had already waived the sovereign rights in question, in formal treaties, usually as *quid pro quo* for U. S. dollars. And by ignoring continuing violations of treaty commitments, the State Department was actually infringing our own sovereign right to grant or loan our dollars under conditions of our own choosing.

If Dulles seeks to lead, he must recognize one fact his predecessors

missed: that in foreign, as in human relations, weakness does not beget respect, either of friends or of enemies.

THERE is another important requisite to successful leadership — not appreciated by former secretaries — which Mr. Dulles must recognize if his policies are to achieve following abroad. That is, the leader who plays favorites among his followers quickly becomes distrusted. If we want the respect of all free nations, we must treat them all with something approaching impartiality. We must abandon the Acheson practice of negotiating with Britain alone problems that equally affect France. We must avoid working out agreements with Europe that are bound to concern Asia, Latin America and the Middle East. We must stop giving aid to one country of a sort that will injure another. We must learn to view each problem in a global aspect, weigh the effects of each proposed solution on all friendly countries.

To illustrate, Secretary Acheson agreed with Britain and France to set up an international organization to control the distribution and pricing of certain vital raw materials, without even consulting the Latin

American and Asiatic nations that produced the materials. We loaned vast sums to India, under generous terms, to increase the production of manganese, thus rendering unfeasible the exploitation by private capital of even more promising deposits in neighboring Brazil. We have encouraged the continuation of discriminatory trade practices among the British Commonwealth countries, among the Western European countries, and between various colonial powers and their empires. But we have repeatedly warned Latin American nations that resort to similar practices would be regarded as violations of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements.

These are only a few of the errors of omission and commission that the State Department has made in its domestic and foreign relations. Probably the greatest consolation that Dulles finds, as he shoulders his tremendous burden, is this:

Although he faces problems more critical and complex than have ever been faced by a Secretary of State before; nevertheless, if there is any truth whatsoever in the adage that men can learn from the mistakes of others, no Secretary in American history has had such a wealth of valuable study material on hand to guide him in his decisions.



» Man is the only animal that blushes. Or needs to. — *Mark Twain*

The Federalist Papers

JAMES MADISON



*To the People of the
State of New York:*

In reviewing the defects of the existing Confederation, and showing that they cannot be supplied by a government of less energy than that before the public, several of the most important principles of the latter fell of course under consideration. But as the ultimate object of these papers is to determine clearly and fully the merits of this Constitution, and the expediency of adopting it, our plan cannot be complete without taking a more critical and thorough survey of the work of the conven-

tion, without examining it on all its sides, comparing it in all its parts, and calculating its probable effects.

That this remaining task may be executed under impressions conducive to a just and fair result, some reflections must in this place be indulged, which candor previously suggests.

It is a misfortune, inseparable from human affairs, that public measures are rarely investigated with that spirit of moderation which is essential to a just estimate of their real tendency to advance or obstruct the public good; and that this spirit is more apt to be diminished than promoted, by those occasions which require an unusual exercise of it. To those who have been led by experience to attend to this consideration, it could not appear surprising, that the act of the convention, which recommends so many important changes and innovations, which may be viewed in so many lights and relations, and which touches the springs of so many passions and interests, should find or excite disposi-

Probably the finest commentary on the principles upon which our government was founded, is the group of essays written by Alexander Hamilton, John Jay and James Madison, known as the Federalist Papers. To the Editors of THE MERCURY, they seem as appropriate today as they were 165 years ago, when the debate over the adoption of the Constitution was at fever heat. THE MERCURY will reprint selected essays from the Federalist Papers in its coming issues.

tions unfriendly, both on one side and on the other, to a fair discussion and accurate judgment of its merits. In some, it has been too evident from their own publications, that they have scanned the proposed Constitution, not only with a predisposition to censure, but with a predetermination to condemn; as the language held by others betrays an opposite predetermination or bias, which must render their opinions also of little moment in the question. In placing, however, these different characters on a level, with respect to the weight of their opinions, I wish not to insinuate that there may not be a material difference in the purity of their intentions. It is but just to remark in favor of the latter descriptions, that as our situation is universally admitted to be peculiarly critical, and to require indispensably that something should be done for our relief, the predetermined patron of what has been actually done may have taken his bias from the weight of these considerations, as well as from considerations of a sinister nature. The predetermined adversary, on the other hand, can have been governed by no venial motive whatever. The intentions of the first may be upright, as they may on the contrary be culpable. The views of the last cannot be upright, and must be culpable. But the truth is, that these papers are not addressed to persons falling under either of these characters. They solicit the attention of those only,

who add to a sincere zeal for the happiness of their country, a temper favorable to a just estimate of the means of promoting it.

Persons of this character will proceed to an examination of the plan submitted by the convention, not only without a disposition to find or to magnify faults; but will see the propriety of reflecting, that a faultless plan was not to be expected. Nor will they barely make allowances for the errors which may be chargeable on the fallibility to which the convention, as a body of men, were liable; but will keep in mind, that they themselves also are but men, and ought not to assume an infallibility in rejudging the fallible opinions of others.

With equal readiness will it be perceived, that besides these inducements to candor, many allowances ought to be made for the difficulties inherent in the very nature of the undertaking referred to the convention.

★ ★ ★

The novelty of the undertaking immediately strikes us. It has been shown in the course of these papers, that the existing Confederation is founded on principles which are fallacious; that we must consequently change this first foundation, and with it the superstructure resting upon it. It has been shown, that the other confederacies which could be consulted as precedents have been

vitiated by the same erroneous principles, and can therefore furnish no other light than that of beacons, which give warning of the course to be shunned, without pointing out that which ought to be pursued. The most that the convention could do in such a situation was to avoid the errors suggested by the past experience of other countries, as well as of our own; and to provide a convenient mode of rectifying their own errors, as future experience may unfold them.

Among the difficulties encountered by the convention, a very important one must have lain in combining the requisite stability and energy in government, with the inviolable attention due to liberty and to the republican form. Without substantially accomplishing this part of their undertaking, they would have very imperfectly fulfilled the object of their appointment, or the expectation of the public; yet that it could not be easily accomplished, will be denied by no one who is unwilling to betray his ignorance of the subject. Energy in government is essential to that security against external and internal danger, and to that prompt and salutary execution of the laws which enter into the very definition of good government. Stability in government is essential to national character and to the advantages annexed to it, as well as to that repose and confidence in the minds of the people, which are among the chief blessings of civil society. An

irregular and mutable legislation is not more an evil in itself than it is odious to the people; and it may be pronounced with assurance that the people of this country, enlightened as they are with regard to the nature, and interested, as the great body of them are, in the effects of good government, will never be satisfied till some remedy be applied to the vicissitudes and uncertainties which characterize the State administrations. On comparing, however, these valuable ingredients with the vital principles of liberty, we must perceive at once the difficulty of mingling them together in their due proportions. The genius of republican liberty seems to demand on one side, not only that all power should be derived from the people, but that those intrusted with it should be kept in dependence on the people, by a short duration of their appointments; and that even during this short period the trust should be placed not in a few, but a number of hands. Stability, on the contrary, requires that the hands in which power is lodged should continue for a length of time the same. A frequent change of men will result from a frequent return of elections; and a frequent change of measures from a frequent change of men: whilst energy in government requires not only a certain duration of power, but the execution of it by a single hand.

How far the convention may have succeeded in this part of their work, will better appear on a more accurate

view of it. From the cursory view here taken, it must clearly appear to have been an arduous part.

Not less arduous must have been the task of marking the proper line of partition between the authority of the general and that of the State governments. Every man will be sensible of this difficulty, in proportion as he has been accustomed to contemplate and discriminate objects extensive and complicated in their nature. The faculties of the mind itself have never yet been distinguished and defined, with satisfactory precision, by all the efforts of the most acute and metaphysical philosophers. Sense, perception, judgment, desire, volition, memory, imagination, are found to be separated by such delicate shades and minute gradations that their boundaries have eluded the most subtle investigations, and remain a pregnant source of ingenious disquisition and controversy. The boundaries between the great kingdom of nature, and, still more, between the various provinces, and lesser portions, into which they are subdivided, afford another illustration of the same important truth. The most sagacious and laborious naturalists have never yet succeeded in tracing with certainty the line which separates the district of vegetable life from the neighboring region of unorganized matter, or which marks the termination of the former and the commencement of the animal empire. A still greater obscurity lies in the dis-

tinctive characters by which the objects in each of these great departments of nature have been arranged.

When we pass from the works of nature, in which all the delineations are perfectly accurate, and appear to be otherwise only from the imperfection of the eye which surveys them, to the institutions of man, in which the obscurity arises as well from the object itself as from the organ by which it is contemplated, we must perceive the necessity of moderating still further our expectations and hopes from the efforts of human sagacity. Experience has instructed us that no skill in the science of government has yet been able to discriminate and define, with sufficient certainty, its three great provinces — the legislative, executive, and judiciary; or even the privileges and powers of the different legislative branches. Questions daily occur in the course of practice, which prove the obscurity which reigns in these subjects, and which puzzle the greatest adepts in political science.

★ ★ ★

The experience of ages, with the continued and combined labors of the most enlightened legislators and jurists, has been equally unsuccessful in delineating the several objects and limits of different codes of laws and different tribunals of justice. The precise extent of the common law, and the statute law, the maritime

law, the ecclesiastical law, the law of corporations, and other local laws and customs, remains still to be clearly and finally established in Great Britain, where accuracy in such subjects has been more industriously pursued than in any other part of the world. The jurisdiction of her several courts, general and local, of law, of equity, of admiralty, etc., is not less a source of frequent and intricate discussions, sufficiently denoting the indeterminate limits by which they are respectively circumscribed. All new laws, though penned with the greatest technical skill, and passed on the fullest and most mature deliberation, are considered as more or less obscure and equivocal, until their meaning be liquidated and ascertained by a series of particular discussions and adjudications. Besides the obscurity arising from the complexity of objects, and the imperfection of the human faculties, the medium through which the conceptions of men are conveyed to each other adds a fresh embarrassment. The use of words is to express ideas. Perspicuity, therefore, requires not only that the ideas should be distinctly formed, but that they should be expressed by words distinctly and exclusively appropriate to them. But no language is so copious as to supply words and phrases for every complex idea, or so correct as not to include many equivocally denoting different ideas. Hence it must happen that however accurately objects may be discriminated

in themselves, and however accurately the discrimination may be considered, the definition of them may be rendered inaccurate by the inaccuracy of the terms in which it is delivered. And this unavoidable inaccuracy must be greater or less, according to the complexity and novelty of the objects defined. When the Almighty Himself condescends to address mankind in their own language, His meaning, luminous as it must be, is rendered dim and doubtful by the cloudy medium through which it is communicated.

★ ★ ★

Here, then, are three sources of vague and incorrect definitions: indistinctness of the object, imperfection of the organ of conception, inadequateness of the vehicle of ideas. Any one of these must produce a certain degree of obscurity. The convention, in delineating the boundary between the federal and State jurisdictions, must have experienced the full effect of them all.

To the difficulties already mentioned may be added the interfering pretensions of the larger and smaller States. We cannot err in supposing that the former would contend for a participation in the government, fully proportioned to their superior wealth and importance; and that the latter would not be less tenacious of the equality at present enjoyed by them. We may well suppose that neither side would entirely yield to

the other, and consequently that the struggle could be terminated only by compromise. It is extremely probable, also, that after the ratio of representation had been adjusted, this very compromise must have produced a fresh struggle between the same parties, to give such a turn to the organization of the government, and to the distribution of its powers, as would increase the importance of the branches, in forming which they had respectively obtained the greatest share of influence. There are features in the Constitution which warrant each of these suppositions; and as far as either of them is well founded, it shows that the convention must have been compelled to sacrifice theoretical propriety to the force of extraneous considerations.

Nor could it have been the large and small States only, which would marshal themselves in opposition to each other on various points. Other combinations, resulting from a difference of local position and policy, must have created additional difficulties. As every State may be divided into different districts, and its citizens into different classes, which give birth to contending interests and local jealousies, so the different parts of the United States are distinguished from each other by a variety of circumstances, which produce a like effect on a larger scale. And although this variety of interests, for reasons sufficiently explained in a former paper, may have

a salutary influence on the administration of the government when formed, yet every one must be sensible of the contrary influence, which must have been experienced in the task of forming it.

Would it be wonderful if, under the pressure of all these difficulties, the convention should have been forced into some deviations from that artificial structure and regular symmetry which an abstract view of the subject might lead an ingenious theorist to bestow on a Constitution planned in his closet or in his imagination? The real wonder is that so many difficulties should have been surmounted, and surmounted with a unanimity almost as unprecedented as it must have been unexpected. It is impossible for any man of candor to reflect on this circumstance without partaking of the astonishment. It is impossible for the man of pious reflection not to perceive in it a finger of that Almighty hand which has been so frequently and signally extended to our relief in the critical stages of the revolution.

★ ★ ★

We had occasion, in a former paper, to take notice of the repeated trials which have been unsuccessfully made in the United Netherlands for reforming the baneful and notorious vices of their constitution. The history of almost all the great councils and consultations held among man-

kind for reconciling their discordant opinions, assuaging their mutual jealousies, and adjusting their respective interests, is a history of factions, contentions, and disappointments, and may be classes among the most dark and degraded pictures which display the infirmities and depravities of the human character. If, in a few scattered instances, a brighter aspect is presented, they serve only as exceptions to admonish us of the general truth; and by their lustre to darken the gloom of the adverse prospect to which they are contrasted. In revolving the causes from which these exceptions result, and applying them to the particular instances before us, we are necessarily led to two im-

portant conclusions. The first is, that the convention must have enjoyed, in a very singular degree, an exemption from the pestilential influence of party animosities — the disease most incident to deliberative bodies, and most apt to contaminate their proceedings. The second conclusion is that all the deputations composing the convention were satisfactorily accommodated by the final act, or were induced to accede to it by a deep conviction of the necessity of sacrificing private opinions and partial interests to the public good, and by a despair of seeing this necessity diminished by delays or by new experiments.

PUBLIUS



» A constitution is a thing antecedent to a government, and a government is only the creature of a constitution. The constitution of a country is not the act of its government, but of the people constituting a government. — *Thomas Paine*

» Let every man honor and love the land of his birth and the race from which he springs and keep their memory green. It is a pious and honorable duty. But let us have done with British-Americans and Irish-Americans and German-Americans, and so on, and all be Americans. . . . If a man is going to be an American at all let him be so without any qualifying adjectives; and if he is going to be something else, let him drop the word American from his personal description. — *Henry Cabot Lodge*

» It is not necessary to finish your sentences in a crowd, but by a sort of mumble, omitting sibilants and dentals. This, indeed, if your words fail you, answers even in public extempore speech, but better where other talking is going on. — *Edward Everett Hale*

They're All

ANTI-COMMUNISTS

By HAROLD LORD VARNEY



Now

IT WAS salty old Jim Watson of Indiana who used to say, "If you can't beat 'em, jine 'em."

Jim has long since gone to his reward but his dictum is still a political canon. Its most assiduous present practitioners are the ex-Communists.

Nowadays, seasoned anti-Communists who were fighting Stalinism before Roosevelt recognized the Soviets are becoming strangers in their own household. The whole anti-Communist movement is in a fair way of being taken over — lock, stock and barrel — by determined men and women, some of whom, only yesterday, were the prize exhibits of the nation's most notorious Communist fronts.

Ex-Communists and fellow travelers staff most of the newer and more heavily financed anti-Red movements which have mushroomed up since the beginning of the Cold War. They pontificate daily as "Communist experts," in

the columns of the leading newspapers. They are grinding out libraries of anti-Communist exposé books, most of which are snatched up eagerly by respected publishers. They are on the radio and TV. They are so omnipotent that some of them are even preparing purge lists to exclude from the anti-Communist fellowship the old anti-Stalinites who made the mistake of fighting Communism too soon.

All of which might be cause for rejoicing if we could be certain that all these eleventh-hour converts had actually got the Communism out of their systems. Unhappily, there is no such assurance. On the contrary, there are mounting indications that some, at least, of the new recruits to orthodoxy are slippery opportunists who are merely following the expedient trends. They have had no genuine change of heart.

This is not to say that the influx of the ex-Communists and the ex-Communist sympathizers into the

anti-Communist line-up has not been an electrifying development. The contribution which some of these ex-Leftists have made is tremendous. It was the Eugene Lyonses and the Max Eastmans who first tore the mask off the myth of a humanitarian Russia. It was Ben Gitlow who revealed to us the sordid meanness of life inside the Communist Party. It was J. B. Matthews who picked up the floundering Committee on Un-American Activities and transformed it into a pitiless instrument of truth. It was Whittaker Chambers and Louis F. Budenz and Elizabeth T. Bentley who lifted the whole case against the Communists from the fog-bank of rumor into documented, inescapable proof. Without the aid of such courageous witnesses, the anti-Communist movement would still be in the impotence of guesswork.

BUT not all who chatter about their anti-Communism have been so helpful.

Among the publications which I read regularly is a newspaper which bubbles with "anti-Communist" protestations — the New York *Post*. Undoubtedly, its "anti-Communist" pose fools many whose knowledge of Communism does not antedate the Marshall Plan. For older readers, however, the claim is bewildering.

The featured writers of the *Post* are a curious company of unreconstructed Left Wingers who formerly

went overboard for all the Russia-first extravagances of the war period, and who have suddenly blossomed forth as "anti-Communists" without passing through any intermediate stage of recantation.

Top editor of the *Post* is James Wechsler, about whom the kindest thing that could be said is that he resigned from the Young Communist League in 1937, where he was known under the party name of Arthur Lawson. But he continued to fellow-travel with the Communists in various front organizations until a few years ago, when it became obviously inexpedient to continue. (As late as 1940, he was one of 17 "Liberal Leaders" who signed a letter to the American Civil Liberties Union protesting against its exclusion of Communists from the offices of the Union.)

By-lined UN correspondent for the *Post* is Joseph P. Lash, ex-head of the Communist American Students' Union and the American Youth Congress, who was denied an appointment in Naval Intelligence during the war because of his Communist affiliations. Chief columnist is Max Lerner, most articulate exponent of the Russia-first line for over a decade, cited over and over again in government reports for pro-Communist activities and affiliations.

When the *Post* team gets through breast-beating over its own "anti-Communism," it goes to work on the slickest hatchet job against the

real anti-Communists that is now on exhibition: By a nonstop smear job on Senator Joe McCarthy, using every gutter trick to destroy the Senator's influence; by a no-holds-barred feud with Walter Winchell, which began only after the columnist launched an intensive campaign against the Soviet party line and its American followers; by an attempted smear job against Senator McCarran, built around the Nevada capers of a former employee of party-liner Vito Marcantonio; by constant derision of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; by a continuous needling of Chiang Kai-shek and his "corrupt" anti-Communist Chinese associates (these attacks have sunk to *pianissimo* in recent months); by a similar discrediting of President Syngman Rhee of Korea; by dropping the column of Dorothy Thompson when she began to call spades spades; by giving all the news breaks to Dean Acheson, Owen Lattimore, Bill Benton, Millard F. Tydings, and other monkey-wrench throwers in the current Washington investigations. (The *Post* delivered itself of the opinion that "all those who believe in freedom in this country are in the debt of Owen Lattimore.")

The loves of the *Post* are as revealing as the hates. The *Post* has its special orchids for the Americans for Democratic Action, Walter Reuther, the New York Liberal Party (the old Social Democratic Federation), the American Civil

Liberties Union, educators who defy loyalty oath acts, and for "civil rights" in its narrow, pressure-group version.

How much believable information on Communism the American public could extract from such an Alice-in-Wonderland editorial policy, it is difficult to state.

The *Post* is not cited as the only, or even the most glaring, offender against the truth. There are numerous other newspapers and magazines of national circulation which pay lip service to anti-Communism and which similarly mislead the people. They constitute a publicity phalanx which, wittingly or unwittingly, is today one of Stalin's prime assets in America.

It would be immature to assume that the hard-boiled controversialists who steer these publications don't know precisely what they are doing.

ANOTHER vehicle the confusionists use with deceptive skill is the widely publicized manifesto demanding soft treatment for Communists by the government. Such manifestoes are always issued in the name of "anti-Communism." And yet they invariably serve Stalinite ends in the particular situation in which they appear.

A case in point was the manifesto of 145 "anti-Communists" which appeared in the press on January 20, 1951 — the day after Senator McCarran announced the appointment of his subcommittee on public se-

curity. The manifesto started with a denouncement of Communists. It then proceeded to argue that the way Senator McCarthy fought the Communists (it did not mention his name but the inference was unmistakable) was the wrong approach and actually helped the Reds. It charged "star-chamber" tactics, and "distortion of the truth."

The comic relief in the incident was the names. Amid a sprinkling of *bona fide* anti-Communist names were such hoary veterans of fellow-traveler and Socialist movements as Alfred Baker Lewis, Roger N. Baldwin, Rex Stout, Reinhold Niebuhr, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Lewis Mumford, Sherwood Eddy, Evans Clark, and Dorothy Kenyon. These were the "gray-eyed people" who were laying down America's line to defeat Stalin's aggression.

AS THE Cold War with Russia sharpens throughout the world, nothing is more urgent than to reappraise the forces that are ostensibly on the anti-Communist side in the propaganda battle. Hitler was not the only power-dreamer who understood the value of the Fifth Column.

Long scrutiny of the tricks and dodges by which the bogus "anti-Communists" spread confusion reveals a number of constantly repeated behavior patterns by which we can recognize the type. An anti-Communist, through stupidity

or association, may fall into one or more of these attitudes, and still be a sincere anti-Stalinite. But when a self-styled "anti-Communist" exhibits them all, there can be little question of his masquerade.

LET us glance briefly at some of these patterns:

(1) The bogus "anti-Communists" are always fiercely anti-McCarthy and anti-McCarran. Their most poisonous diatribes are reserved for these upsetters of the Communist apple cart in Washington and the UN.

(2) When direct smears of "McCarthyism" fail, they always have a flank attack to fall back upon. This is the tricky argument that we must not employ McCarthyism because the Communists themselves want us to fight them that way.

Two of those who have recently used this gambit tellingly are Morris L. Ernst (in his "Report on the American Communist") and Herbert A. Philbrick. In Philbrick's case, the argument seems plausible because he was a member of the Communist Party until recently, and can assumedly testify from personal experience — although no possible way exists to check him. Of course, the argument is nonsense, but, as long as it throws doubt on the value of McCarthy and McCarran, it blunts the effectiveness of their investigations.

(3) They invariably raise the cry of "Russian propaganda." Nothing

has been such a damper upon a forth-right American anti-Communist policy in recent years as this induced fear that we mustn't go too far, lest the Russians use our actions as fodder for their propaganda among the restless colonials, the colored races, and the satellites. This phobia has gripped the master minds of our Voice of America, who lecture us constantly on the necessity of following domestic policies which will look good in the propaganda battle with Moscow. The "pseudo-anti-Communist" is always an expert at plying this argument.

Nothing is so humiliating to American sovereignty as the suggestion that we cannot do as we please in our domestic policies lest the United Nations, or Britain, or Russian propaganda writers won't like it. By raising this bugaboo of "Russian propaganda," the bogus anti-Communists have succeeded in watering down American policies in repeated instances. They have persuaded us, for example, that we must pull our punches in China, in Korea, in Africa, and in the United Nations, to soothe foreign sensibilities. Against a realistic Russia, America is induced to fight frightened in every decisive trouble spot in the world.

(4) To obscure the target, they endeavor to keep alive the anti-fascist issue. In the face of a live Stalin, they are still beating the bones of a dead Hitler. There actually exists a "Society," headed by

a Columbia University professor, "To Prevent World War III," not by stopping Stalin but by enforcing a vengeful peace upon Germany. It may be of significance that the head of this organization — Professor Mark Van Doren — was also a sponsor of the March, 1949 Waldorf-Astoria "World Peace Conference," which the State Department announced was Communist-organized.

(5) They have always tearfully worried about the civil liberties of accused Communists. True, the civil liberties issue has worn rather thin since Mrs. Roosevelt wrote in her August 17, 1948 column that:

"Smearing good people like Laughlin Currie, Alger Hiss and others is, I think, unforgivable. Anyone knowing either Mr. Currie or Mr. Hiss, two people whom I happen to know fairly well, would not need any denial on their part to know that they were not Communists."

However, the self-styled "anti-Communists" are still shedding salt tears over the persecution of such worthies as Owen Lattimore, John Carter Vincent and Dr. Edward U. Condon.

When William W. Remington was first unmasked as a wartime member of the Soviet spy ring, the "anti-Communist" Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., chairman of the executive committee of the "anti-Communist" Americans for Democratic Action, became his indefatigable attorney, and extracted \$20,000 from the "anti-Communist" Robert Marshall

Civil Liberties Trust to finance the defense. The *New Yorker*, on May 21, 1949, published a 20-page article extolling the Remington defense as a victory for civil liberties. When Remington was found guilty of perjury recently, these exultant words were placed in rather absurd relief.

When the late Agnes Smedley was unmasked by General MacArthur's Tokyo office as a member of the Sorge Japanese Soviet spy ring, "anti-Communist" O. John Rogge, her attorney, stirred up such a storm of protest against the accusation on the radio and in the "anti-Communist" liberal press that a timid Army Public Information Division chief in Washington was induced to disavow the Tokyo statement. "Anti-Communist" Harold L. Ickes burst into print to declare that "no one who knows Miss Smedley would ever suspect that this courageous and intelligent American citizen has stooped so low as to be a spy for any country."

When Miss Smedley died in 1951, she willed her estate to General Chu Teh, chief of the Chinese Communist Army.

(6) They are usually supporters of world government, in some one of its proposed forms. Their particular enthusiasm is reserved for the "Point-4" program, and they would have the United States assume the responsibility for raising the living standards of the whole globe. "Anti-Communist" Henry A. Wallace was the original parent of this bright

share-the-wealth idea. In one of its later versions, "anti-Communist" Walter Reuther has proposed that the United States should bestow two trillion dollars abroad over the next century.

(7) They are virulently against General MacArthur, and they all rejoiced at the Truman-Acheson decision to recall him. MacArthur means to the crypto-anti-Communist a constant threat to Red China. To such "anti-Communists," it is better that the United States lose the Korean War, than that the hated Chiang Kai-shek return to the mainland.

(8) In Asian policy, their hopes are placed on India. Socialist Nehru, in their view, is a far-sighted statesman who "understands" the Russians, where we do not. Indian Ambassador Pannikar's double-faced maneuverings in Red China, both before and after the fall of the Chinese Nationalists, are eulogized. India's consistent stand against an anti-Communist bloc in South Asia is approved. The bogus "anti-Communist" is strong for more American aid for India, and less for the Philippines, Japan, Formosa and Thailand.

(9) Similarly, in Europe, he is anti-Spain, but he is trustfully pro-Tito.

These are some of the earmarks of the "anti-Communist" who is still keeping a tentative foot in the doorway of Stalinist approval.

However, there is another and

more certain way of identifying the half-hearted ex-Communist or ex-fellow traveler. This is by his attitude toward the current government anti-Communist effort.

The ex-Communist or ex-fellow traveler who is sincere in his re-orientation is willing to aid the government in such investigations as those of the Senate subcommittee on internal security, or the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or in the Department of Justice prosecutions. The ex-Communist who holds back from this manifest duty reveals the hollowness of his "anti-Communist" pretense.

ADMITTEDLY, it is not a happy experience, to a man of normal sensitivity, to be cast in the role of an informer. And yet this is a price which the ex-Communist must pay, if he is to be true to himself and to his nation.

Whittaker Chambers has said the definitive thing on this problem:

"If the ex-Communist truly believes that Communism is evil, if he truly means to struggle against it as an evil, and as the price of his once having accepted it, he must decide to become an informer; in that war which Communism insists on waging, and which therefore he cannot evade, he has one specific contribution to make — his special knowledge of the enemy. . . . For in the end, the choice for the ex-Communist is between shielding a small number of people who still actively further what he now sees to be evil,

or of helping to shield millions from that evil which threatens even their souls. Those who do not inform are still conniving at that evil."

We have had some striking cases of witnesses unwilling to bare their pasts in the hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations before the McCarran Committee.

Anyone who will plow through the wearisome pages of evasive, slippery, defiant testimony of an Edward C. Carter or an Owen Lattimore can have little doubt that these were men who had guilty knowledge which they were desperately trying to withhold from their government. In agreeable contrast with the Carter and Lattimore quibblings was the testimony of such men as Karl Wittfogel and Kenneth C. Colegrove before the same committee. Both Wittfogel and Colegrove had been equally mistaken with Lattimore about the Chinese Communists. The difference was that, having seen their error, they were eager to help their government throw the X-ray upon the subterranean causes of the ghastly China blunder. Carter and Lattimore were not.

And yet both Lattimore and Carter indignantly aver that they are "anti-Communists." They must be regarded as archetypes of the *sinister forces which were working, at the highest government levels, to stultify America's anti-Communist program.*

The ivory tower dweller may admire the fastidiousness of a Lil-

lian Hellman, who told the Committee on Un-American Activities that "I cannot and will not cut my conscience to fit this year's fashions." But a personal code which bars an American from aiding his government in time of peril is a luxury which no private citizen can afford. A nation of Miss Hellmans would inevitably go down before the dark forces which are abroad in the world today.

Imperfect as it is, America has no better yardstick for identifying the genuine anti-Communist than the yardstick which the American Legion and other patriotic organizations have approved — that the ex-Communist give his government the whole story of his career in Communism. Some masqueraders will slip through even this net. But the unwilling or half-truth witnesses will be screened out. Their refusal will stigmatize them for what they are, in the eyes of all fair-minded Americans.

AMERICA has gone far, in its crusade against subversives, since 1947 when Bert Andrews, of the New York *Herald Tribune*, received the Pulitzer Prize for ridiculing the loyalty probes in Washington as a "witch hunt." The time is past when those who raised the Communist issue could be sneeringly dismissed as "primitives" (a favorite epithet of Max Lerner), or smeared as potential "fascists." Today it is the pro-Communists who are on the

defensive, and who are fearsomely seeking the protective coloration of "anti-Communism."

And yet, some of the old confusionist spirit still survives in minds which should know better. An instance is the incredible recent editorial in the New York *Times* declaring that such a Johnnie-come-lately among organizations as the "Committee on the Present Danger" is prepared to take over the anti-Communist movement and give it a "respectability" which it has lacked "because of abuses by well-meaning zealots, more or less cynical demagogues, and those who make anti-Communism a profession."

The sheer impudence of such a statement may be realized when we recall that these "zealots" and the "professionals" are the ones who unmasked Alger Hiss, forced Service, Vincent, Clubb, Brunauer, Duran, Stone, Keeney, and Marzani out of the State Department, drove Remington and Lee from the Commerce Department, forced 48 Communist-minded officials out of the UN, exposed the Communist influence in Hollywood and on the New York stage, induced Phil Murray to purge the Communist unions out of the CIO, broke the grip of Communism on the New York schools, while accomplishing other chores of major importance in the last five years.

Contrariwise, there is grim humor in the fact that the Committee on the Present Danger is headed by

James B. Conant, who, as president of Harvard, kept 76 teachers on his faculty after they had been revealed as members or sponsors of organizations cited by the Department of Justice or the Committee on Un-American Activities as "Communist fronts."

Such leadership may be "respectable," but we shudder to think where it would take the anti-Communist cause.

Between the planned confusionism of the bogus "anti-Communists" and the babe-in-the-woods naïveté of the Dr. Conants and the other good people who have just discovered the Communist problem, America's battle against Stalinism will face many pitfalls in the coming years.

We are all anti-Communists now, but some of us have our fingers crossed.



» You are underrating the President (Lincoln). I grant that he lacks higher education and his manners are not in accord with European conceptions of the dignity of a chief magistrate. He is a well-developed child of nature and is not skilled in polite phrases and poses. But he is a man of profound feeling, correct and firm principles and incorruptible honesty. His motives are unquestionable, and he possesses to a remarkable degree the characteristic, God-given trait of this people, sound common sense. — *Carl Schurz*

» It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfaction, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interests to his own. — *Edmund Burke*

» Of "Americanism" of the right sort we cannot have too much. Mere vamping and boasting become a nation as little as a man. But honest, outspoken pride and faith in our country are infinitely better and more to be respected than the cultivated reserve which sets it down as ill-bred and in bad taste ever to refer to our country except by way of deprecation, criticism, or general negation.

— *Henry Cabot Lodge*

DOWN *to* EARTH

By Alan Devoe

LADY, A HORSE



IN EVERY gravely troubled time in human history, every profound crisis of confusion, desperate men turn childish.

The "adult" layer of us — the thinking man, reflective man, insighted man — is only, as Henry Thoreau used to say, our "top-head." In time of tranquillity, the overrule and captaincy of this top-head may be maintained with reasonable consistence. But underneath it there is the huge, dark, disorganized jumble of our pre-rational self: the self of blind instinct and blood-impulse, the self of childishness, of pre-childishness, even of pre-humanness, going back and back, deep and down, to the most ancient stirs and thrusts of mindless organic life. The reasoning and intellective "I" that presides as our psyche's organizing principle holds a difficult and uneasy tenure over a vast pack of eager infantilities, barely suppressed rages of instinct, leashed drives of animal urgency and hankerings of childish wish. In good times, we keep this

chaotic zoo under control. Holding (as it were) in one hand the whip of reason and in the other the chair of will, we direct and subdue our cageful of psychic creatures, and we may look upon them with a cool smile of mastership.

It is a thing of some effort and strain, at best, to keep always alertly holding the whip and tilting the chair at the ready. It becomes much harder if there are factors in our life to confuse us, to shake our self-confidence, to make us uneasy and unsure, possibly to hint to us that the whole stern performance is only a rather empty thing, scarcely worth doing. When such dismaying and unsettling factors as this become strong enough in the individual life of one of us, we may suddenly, in a frantic gesture, throw down the whip and the chair and in effect cry out: "Oh, what's the *use*. Let's just let the animals loose. Let's just let them take over." In a gesture of easeful surrender and release, the "I" withdraws; and now — the arena is in entire charge of a tiger of rage, a lion of weeping, a padding leopard

of self-assertion unrestrained. The creatures of our infancy are in charge.

Nervous breakdown, the phrase is. Crack-up.

WHAT can happen to us, like this, as individuals, can also happen to us collectively. The strains and confusions that make the whip waver, the chair begin to sag, can multiply and spread to touch a whole people with misgiving and fatal persuasions. "What is all this exhausting act availing you? Why try to keep it up, on and on and on, tired as you are, and confused, and bewildered? What good is all this doing? Wouldn't it be a blessed relief just to slump down and let this ocelot of 3-year-old destructiveness have his way, and this puma of 5-year-old credulity, and this panther of infantile fantasy? Come; relax; rest; you cannot go on; turn them loose! Turn them loose!"

No crack-up, individual or collective, is without its premonitory signs: the first slight loosening of grip upon the whip, the first waverings of the chair, the telltale hints that reason is beginning to feel tempted toward surrendering sovereignty. The signs are visible to a psychiatrist, watching an individual. They are visible to a social historian, watching a people and an era. They are visible in the growing restlessness and undiscipline of the beasts in the cage, one by one venturing larger insolences and insubordinations as

they eye the wavering whip, the loosening fingers on the chair.

Many thoughtful observers have been discerning and recording what they take to be danger-signs of crack-up in this twentieth century: signs that the beasts of childishness and anti-reason are growing restless and overbold, signs that collective Reasoning Man is coming perilously close to that last hysteric moment when, finding the wielding of adult will and intellect insufferably hard, he throws down his symbolic instruments of authority and suffers the released creatures of childish pre-reason to take over.

They point to various things, these observers.

THERE are (for instance) the cults of unintelligibility, in writing, in painting: those cults which have retreated to holding that it is not the function of a created work to communicate or to be controlled in any frame of common reference, but only to *be*, as an eruption of the private self, lonely, incommunicative and as outside discipline as those private sounds, only self-meaningful, that madmen make in the dark corners of their cells. Or again, there are the spreading schools in philosophy which hold, in a circular logic in nihilism, that thought itself affords no insight into the real. Nothing is any truer than anything else: we belabor our wits in vain in seeking to know; what is certain is only subjective experience, and nothing

means anything. Or yet again, there is the loss of confidence, as a distant outcome from findings of Freud, in any true possession of any real "I," the widely harbored misgiving that this "self" — once the initial premise on which all edifices of thinking rested — is only a kind of myth thrown up, as it were, by twitches and heaves in the dark depths of our physiochemical interior.

There are many things to which grave observers can point. See the faltering of whip and chair, they can say, betokening that Rational Man is at crack-up point, displayed in his readiness to trade independence and assured self-reliance for almost any kind of freedom from responsibility. What is that but a weakening toward the moment when he will surrender to the beast of Infantile Dependence? See the statistic that one person in every twelve, now, must spend part of his life in a mental hospital. What is that but reason letting go, the mastership being surrendered, the whip falling from the hopeless hand? Observe the restless growling and prowling of the whole psychic cageful of the beasts of undisciplined instinct, child-impulse, infant tantrum, cradle-fantasy. Who can doubt that the trainer, our collective self, our once commanding self with the confident whip of reason and the sturdy chair of will, has in confusion grown weary, weary, and is nearly ready to commit that final gesture of surrender to childishness in which the instruments of control are

dropped and the beasts in triumph hear the word that frees them. "Run loose. Take over. Your will, not mine, be done."

IT IS not a naturalist's business, or competence, to say how right may be the observers who think they discern, in the happenings of our time, the signals of this ruinous surrender. But he may take note, at any rate, of one evidence that does fall within his province and that does suggest, if only in its small way, a disheartening falter in our adult hold upon the whips and chairs of rationality's authority over childishness. This is the Acceptance of Marvels.

We are confronted by an enigmatic universe. We do not now understand it, and in the nature of things we shall never be able to comprehend it, for nothing can be truly comprehended except by getting altogether outside it and, as it were, surrounding it. We are permanently creatures. There is vouchsafed to us, however, a certain essential minimum of discoverable truth. In our times of adult adjustment and authority, we are willing to act on that and settle for that. We do not know everything; we cannot control everything; the universe is full of immutabilities and inscrutabilities which may sometimes seem a trial to us; but we will accept in confidence and humility such knowable things as the round of the seasons, the way two and two make

four, and the turn of the planet on its axis. We will make do with this.

But childishness won't. Childishness wants no fettering by any limits, any laws, any rules, any restrictions to the reach of the mind or the puissance of magic. Childishness would have it (or pout and rail and throw a tantrum) that at any moment a mushroom may metamorphose into a bird, or the sun rise in the west, or a tree speak. Childishness would have it that the Absolute must disclose itself to us, in signs, portents, oracles.

Whenever there begins to be a great casting of horoscopes, a peering into birds' entrails, a wildfire word-of-mouth report, finding ready acceptance, that Little Men from Outer Space are busy amongst us and that Nostradamus has been reincarnated . . . whenever this kind of eager Acceptance of Marvels becomes our mood, the meaning is not mistakable. It means we have begun to find ourselves inadequate to the whip and the chair. We have begun to say to ourselves: Would it really do much harm to let this one beast of childish irrationality loose? After all, it is a wearying, wearying business, being grown.

NEAR Richmond, it seems, there is a horse named Lady. This horse, employing a kind of equine typewriter, taps out answers to questions, for a fee paid to her owner. During recent weeks there have come to the *Down to Earth* depart-

ment no less than thirty-nine solemn-minded letters about Lady.

Seldom over the years have there come so many letters about any actual animal of the actual woods and fields — any actual weasel, actual woodchuck, any real fox-smelling fox of the rocky uplands — as have come concerning this horse whose devoutly alleged gifts include solving distant murders, predicting election outcomes, forecasting race-results, advising where lost objects can be found, and doing problems in cube-root.

What (say the letters) does a naturalist make of Lady's marvels? How does she do these things? In what manner is she — as so obviously she is — in communication with the Beyond?

Lady, it is likely, may be a horse uncommonly intelligent. She may be, not impossibly, a telepathic horse. But what a naturalist makes of her foreknowledge of election results, her higher mathematics, her insights shared with God alone, is only this:

Lady, the real Lady, the one with the honest horse-dung on her hooves and a twitching ear in fly-time, need not disturb us. No animal need, for it is of this earth and lit with the sunlight of common day. What Lady, rather, conjures up in a naturalist's mind, is a recognition of certain symbolic and far more terrifying animals: the animals of our human under-conscious, the beasts of childishness stirring, the

dark animals of old chaos and unreason.

Peace and good luck to Lady. May she live long and full of oats in a warm stall. But these other beasts which she has in her innocence set stirring . . . Well, we live in a hard

and confusing time, and it is a weary thing to keep command of each his private zoo of beasts from the bygone.

So easily as that does the hand relax loose upon the whip, and the chair slip, falling.



» What we have a right to expect of the American boy is that he shall turn out to be a good American man. The boy can best become a good man by being a good boy — not a goody-goody boy, but just a plain good boy. I do not mean that he must love only the negative virtues; I mean that he must love the positive virtues also. "Good," in the largest sense, should include whatever is fine, straightforward, clean, brave, and manly. The best boys I know — the best men I know — are good at their studies or their business, fearless and stalwart, hated and feared by all that is wicked and depraved, incapable of submitting to wrongdoing, and equally incapable of being aught but tender to the weak and helpless. Of course the effect that a thoroughly manly, thoroughly straight and upright boy can have upon the companions of his own age, and upon those who are younger, is incalculable. If he is not thoroughly manly, then they will not respect him, and his good qualities will count for but little; while, of course, if he is mean, cruel or wicked, then his physical strength and force of mind merely make him so much the more objectionable a member of society. He can not do good work if he is not strong and does not try with his whole heart and soul to count in any contest; and his strength will be a curse to himself and to everyone else if he does not have a thorough command over himself and over his own evil passions, and if he does not use his strength on the side of decency, justice and fair dealing.

In short, in life, as in a football-game, the principle to follow is: Hit the line hard; don't foul and don't shirk, but hit the line hard.

— *"The American Boy"* by Theodore Roosevelt

» He reminds me of the man who murdered his parents, and when sentence was about to be pronounced, pleaded for mercy on the ground that he was an orphan. — *Abraham Lincoln*

BOOKS IN REVIEW

BY FRANK MEYER

ESSENTIAL to any serious consideration of American policy is the recognition that we are involved in a desperate struggle for survival against an enemy whose only aim is total world power. While open recognition of this fact of life is still not considered quite "respectable" in many literary circles, nevertheless, among the current books there are an encouraging number devoted to a searching and hard-headed analysis of our situation. Their common inspiration can be summed up in the words of George Washington: "Our cruel and unrelenting enemy leaves us only the choice of a brave resistance, or the most abject submission. We have, therefore, to resolve to conquer or to die." This is the motto with which Stefan T. Possony begins *A Century of Conflict, Communist Techniques of World Revolution* (Regnery, \$7.50).

It has become a commonplace to say that Hitler stated openly what he planned to do in *Mein Kampf*, and that all the world had to do was to read and prepare. So, the argument runs, all we have to do is to read what the Communists say, and judge accordingly. The difficulty is that the Communists say so many

things. There is always something that Lenin or Stalin or some other authoritative spokesman has said which can be used to back up any argument on how to deal with them. Roosevelt found arguments for a policy of appeasement, Truman for co-existence, Kennan for containment.

What Mr. Possony sets out to do is to separate the wheat from the chaff, to find in the voluminous record both of what Bolsheviks do and of what they say, their fundamental policy, their intentions and their methods. The two themes which run through his book are expressed, the first in the title of his introduction, "Violence is the father of all things," and the second in Lenin's axiom that Communists must learn to use all forms of struggle, must adapt their techniques to every change in the objective situation.

The first theme was clearly stated in the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848, which begins: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles," and ends: "[the Communists] declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing

social conditions." From then to now, through a thousand varying day-to-day shifts of propaganda, no contradiction of this basic thesis has been tolerated in the Communist movement.

But the implementation of this principle is not a simple matter. It is devious, manifold, and thorough, using every possible means to achieve the one clear end. This is what Lenin meant by learning "to master all forms of struggle."

Mr. Possony shows how, for example, the campaign for the conquest of China was carried on. Under the unified command of the chiefs of the Soviet Party, each of the forces participating in that campaign had its own specific task. The Chinese Red Army fought on the field of battle. The underground Chinese Party carried on propaganda, organization, subversion, sabotage, espionage behind the Nationalist lines. The Communist forces in the United States had the task of propaganda and of subversion of American policy. It was their duty to deflect American aid from Chiang Kai-Shek, to win support for Mao Tse-Tung if possible, and, if not, to secure American neutrality. How the concept of the Chinese Communists as agrarian reformers was developed to achieve that aim and how it was sold to the American people, is recorded in detail in the fourteen volumes of the hearings before the McCarran Committee on the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Soviet War Doctrine

This is but one campaign, though a vital one, in the long history of the Communist war for power. But it is typical. What the Communists say they are doing varies from time to time and from place to place in accordance with a master plan. But, as the French say, "the more it changes, the more it is the same thing." It is the virtue of Mr. Possony's book to have translated the Marxist language in which the principles of this strategy are written into terms that are understandable to the American reader.

Since the Communists see history as warfare continuous and unrelenting, he has analyzed their strategy as a general would analyze the war doctrine of his enemies on the basis of the history of their previous wars and the materials of their military journals and publications. He develops his argument historically, dealing successively with the origins of the Communist doctrine, the first round of world revolution in Russia, the doctrinal ferment and consolidation of the succeeding years, the second round of Soviet conquest in Eastern Europe, and the third round in China. The book concludes with an estimate of the Communist approach to the fourth and potentially final round, in which the main enemy is the United States, and with a statement of the central principles of what he calls Soviet "conflict management."

These principles are clearly stated, and illustrated with a number of excellent diagrams. First, war is continuous. The Communists have developed to the utmost limits the theories of the German strategist, Clausewitz. Formal peace is but another form of attack, and shooting war takes over the unfinished tasks of peacetime revolutionary activity. Secondly, there is no absolute priority to front or rear warfare. Propaganda, organization, industrial strife, policy subversion leading to armed insurrection and internal revolution, all are coordinated with warfare in the traditional sense in a single general-staff plan. From the perversion of a community council for better housing or for Negro rights, or the direction of a work stoppage against an unpopular foreman, to the loosing of nuclear weapons on New York, Detroit, and Washington, everything has its proper place and time within the over-all strategy.

Thirdly, all phases of the development of the struggle take place under the military command of the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, with the world Communist Parties functioning as the primary chain of command. The government bureaucracy and the army in Communist countries, the espionage and infiltration rings beyond the Iron Curtain, the special Communist "control" organizations, all are subject to primary political leadership.

Against such an enemy only "an extended strategy" of our own, developed within the limitations of our moral outlook, can prevent disaster. While Mr. Possony does not believe that all-out shooting war is inevitable, he thinks it can be avoided only if we make it "*an extreme risk* for the Soviets . . . and work toward a gradual modification, contraction, and replacement of Soviet rule." The point of the matter is that we must stop deluding ourselves that there is an easy way out. Unless we develop a policy based on the fundamental belief that, bad as war is, slavery is worse, there will be no sanction behind anything we do. If at every turn Stalin is convinced that we are bluffing, he will out-bluff us. He has iron nerves and no scruples.

WE NEED what Brigadier General Frank L. Howley, in *Your War for Peace* (Holt, \$2.75), calls "an aggressive policy of righteousness." As our military governor of Berlin from the occupation through the Berlin airlift, he had an excellent opportunity to compare the difference between a policy of appeasement and one of resistance in its effect on the Russians. This book is based on his experiences then and upon a recent extended trip to France and Western Germany. His observations are earthy and to the point. He makes little effort at abstract judgment, but he draws his conclusions from the actual life of

people and the progress of events. Those conclusions have the weaknesses and the strengths of that approach. His picture of the French and German people today and of the state of our policy in Europe rather belies his more optimistic views of NATO, of the results of the Marshall Plan, or of such men as Schumacher. But, on the other hand, his horse-sense and his experience come to the rescue when he discusses the tone of American policy.

The hope of Russia's collapsing through the policy of containment, he says, "is about as valid as the hope that a boxer in the ring with the heavyweight champion of the world could win by letting the champ exhaust himself punching." In his own way, he comes out with conclusions remarkably similar to Mr. Possony's. Our policy must "use whatever force is best calculated to serve our purposes, be they military, economic, political, or psychological. Such a policy cannot be piecemeal. It has to be all or nothing. There is no point in being strong in Korea, if we are weak at a conference table in Paris." If I might sum up in one word what General Howley has shown he has and what he thinks our policy needs, that word is "guts."

The Rope Trick

Klaus Mehnert tackles the problem from a different side, and a most interesting one. After all, this machine we are fighting has to be

staffed by human beings. Communists are devoted, self-sacrificing, able. It is understandable how in the earlier revolutionary days such men were attracted by enthusiasm for what seemed to be a rational and inspiring fight to change the world. It is much harder to understand how they are recruited today when the revolution has become identical with the power drive of the men in the Kremlin.

IN *Stalin Versus Marx* (Macmillan, \$2.00), Dr. Mehnert traces the tortuous development of Communist doctrine by which Stalin has been able to combine "Workers of the world, unite" with "the world-historic role of the Russian people." Outside the dialectical discipline of Communist thinking, this would seem to be as impossible as the Indian rope trick. But it can be done and it has been done. It would be underestimating our enemy to ignore the intellectual dexterity with which such opposites are bound together, so that "Stalin's plane," as Dr. Mehnert puts it, can be powered with "the two motors" of nationalism and internationalism. It is well worth a reader's effort to follow the sometimes abstruse analysis of this book to gain some understanding of the inner processes of Communist thinking.

Although Dr. Mehnert puts his finger on the essential characteristics of Stalinism, I think he fails to realize how much of what Stalin has

made explicit has always been potential in Marx. Furthermore, after thirty years of shifts and turns, atrocities and purges, all conducted in the name of progress, it is perhaps wishful thinking to hope that the new doctrines have within themselves a contradiction which will tear the Communist system apart. Previous contradictions have not done so, and, absurd as some aspects of the latest doctrines may seem to us, there is no reason to believe that they will do so, either.

WHILE *Stalin Versus Marx* gives intellectual insight into the rationale of Communism, Liu Shaw-Tong shows what Communism means in the living experience of a people but recently subjugated by its iron will. *Out of Red China* (Duell, Sloan, Pearce — Little, Brown, \$4.00) tells the story of his life as a young Chinese student who for a year after the capture of Peiping worked for the Communist movement. In the end, revolted at what he saw and what he was forced to do, he escaped to Hong Kong. The book, he says in his preface, is the "story of a liberal being adjusted to the conditions of totalitarianism." In his case, the adjustment did not succeed; but his experiences in the course of it make one of the few really human stories we have of what it is like to be catapulted suddenly into the Communist apparatus for "remaking the personality."

It is certainly the first thing of the

kind we have had out of China. Although the story is told with a wise and quiet detachment that is characteristically Chinese and is illuminated with sparks of humor, it contains incident after incident of sickening human tragedy and pathetic tales of the destruction of personality. No one who reads it can fail to get some feel of the soul-destroying character of Communist "education."

CHINA is the scene of the greatest Bolshevik victory since the Russian Revolution, and the rest of Asia has become the battlefield of the next stage of the struggle. Ebed Van der Vlugt's *Asia Aflame* (Devin-Adair, \$6.00) is an ambitious and thought-provoking attempt to survey the whole story of Communist strategy in the East and to analyze the underlying factors in the crisis of Asia. A Netherlands lawyer and former British intelligence officer, with years of living in the Orient, Dr. Van der Vlugt is very obviously a man whose practical experience has been enriched with serious thought on fundamental human questions.

The body of the book is devoted to an analysis of the history and current situation of Asia, area by area. An enormous amount of material is covered. The discussion of Southeast Asia and Indonesia is particularly valuable, as this is the section Dr. Van der Vlugt knows best personally and on which there is the least ma-

terial readily available. The chapter on China is an excellent summary and the briefer material on India is stimulating. On the Moslem Middle East he is perhaps weakest, particularly for the later years.

Mass or People?

Useful as the book is for its survey of Asia and its well-documented history of Communist strategy and tactics in the attack on Asia, its greatest merit lies in the effort Dr. Van der Vlugt makes to get at the underlying causes of Communist success. To what manner of men do the specious slogans and philosophy of Communism appeal? Dr. Van der Vlugt finds the answer in the difference between "a mass" and "a people." When the fundamental beliefs of a society, the bonds of family and church and community are rotted away by materialism or torn loose by such great changes in the manner of men's living as modern industrialism brought in its train, then atomized individuals without root or faith are created in their millions. Nor is this merely a question of the lower strata of society. The "mass-mind," as Ortega y Gasset showed, penetrates all sections of society. To such men without hope or direction, Communism appeals.

This appeal is less strong in the West, where the forms of our life have gradually matured with the development of the industrial revolution so that our institutions continue to reflect the deep truths of our

tradition. We still remain a people. In Asia, however, where both the hopes and the agonies of industrialism have struck deeply and in a concentrated period, neither the old institutions of the East nor the institutions of the West fit men's needs. The creation of "mass man" goes on with frightening rapidity. This, Dr. Van der Vlugt believes, has been intensified by the almost instantaneous collapse of Western rule, leaving Asia wide open to the long-planned Communist attack.

ONE OF the sources of this moral confusion in our midst is the dulling of the meaning of words which in the early days of the republic were sharply and clearly understood. The word "democracy" in the West has always meant the will of the people exercised *within the limits of the constitutional guarantees of the inviolate rights of each individual person*. "Democracy" to the Communist means the unlimited supremacy of the will of the mass as conceived by the leader. This concept in one form or another has gained much headway among us. Had not the Western and American meaning of the word been for many years "hollowed out" by the slow attrition of the teachings of the Founding Fathers, it would not have become possible for so many Americans to forget that our democracy is first of all constitutional democracy.

No one foresaw the dangers of such a development more clearly

than the 19th-century English historian, Lord Acton. The renewed interest in his thinking is evidenced by the appearance of two works, *Essays on Church and State* (Viking, \$6.00) and *Acton's Political Philosophy* by G. E. Fasnacht (Viking, \$4.00). Most people know the axiom which crowns his thought: "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." But for many years his writings have not been readily accessible. The reappearance of *Essays on Church and State*, with an excellent introduction by Douglas Woodruff, is one more step in remedying this lack.

Mr. Fasnacht's book is an even greater boon to the general reader. Drawing from Acton's published works and from masses of unpublished notes, he has prepared an extremely able presentation of his political philosophy.

In the development of political thought, Acton perhaps more than any American scholar serves as a connecting link between the *Federalist* papers and our day. He devoted a lifetime of study and hard thinking to the one central question of liberty. His was the true liberalism which puts as the aim of politics the preservation of freedom. He lived to see the beginnings of an era in which the greatest danger to freedom came not from hereditary monarchs nor entrenched aristocracies but from demagogues speaking in the name of an untrammelled majority, and from a state uncontrolled by law. "State

absolutism," he wrote, "is the modern danger." Liberty can be secured only when it is founded on truths "which men did not invent and may not abjure." No form of government can guarantee liberty unless it is based upon the recognition of this truth by conscience.

But, men being imperfect, there are certain principles of government which can strengthen the operation of conscience. Separation of powers, federalism, is the best of such guarantees: "Divided, or rather multiplied authorities are the foundation of good government." "The true natural check on absolute democracy is the federal system, which limits the central government by the powers reserved and the state governments by the powers they have ceded. It is the one immortal tribute of America to political science, for state rights are at the same time the consummation and the guard of democracy."

The richness of Acton's thought throws light on a hundred problems of our own time. One more quotation may perhaps be of interest as a message from one of the greatest liberals of the 19th century to the so-called liberals of today: "Burke's intolerance from 1773-1791 amounted to this — don't tolerate those who would establish intolerance. It is perfectly true."

"The Mass Is a Lie"

A liberalism rooted in tradition, a conservatism aware that the institu-

tions of society must serve the needs of people, this is the heritage upon which our free institutions are based. Two recent books, one from England, one from France, are saturated with this spirit. *A House in Bryanston Square* by Algernon Cecil (Harcourt, Brace, \$5.00) and *Man Against Mass Society* by Gabriel Marcel (Regnery, \$4.50), each in its own way shows how deep wisdom can give content to men's lives and breadth to their vision without giving way to that tolerance of evil which is today all too often equated with true tolerance. Neither Mr. Cecil nor M. Marcel finds life a simple contrast of black and white. But they both know that it is from the individual and the conscience of the individual that society and the state take their meaning and their reason for existence.

A House in Bryanston Square sets forth the mature reflections of a man, steeped in the English tradition, who has lived through the devastating years of the twentieth century. It has been widely compared with *The Education of Henry Adams*, and it has more than one similarity with that great book. As Adams, who was always an eighteenth-century man though he lived in the nineteenth century, was able to see his own time with so much greater clarity than did most of his contemporaries, so Mr. Cecil's fundamentally nineteenth-century outlook brings into new focus problems with which we are all wrestling.

Gabriel Marcel grapples more directly with the moral and spiritual problems of our day. He is more "committed"; but his is a commitment utterly free of that characteristic modern arrogance which believes that man can put himself in the place of God and solve all problems with a simple formula. He, too, like Lord Acton and Algernon Cecil, is primarily concerned with the preservation of human dignity and freedom. He sees the center of the danger in that materialistic approach which considers man as a thing and forgets the individual in abstractions. But man *is* an individual. After all, "the mass itself is a lie." It is the universal spirit in the soul of each individual that is the truth. Therein lies the hope of the survival of free society.

MISCELLANY

The Second Sex. By Simone de Beauvoir. Translated by H. M. Parshley. Knopf. \$10.00.

This book should be reviewed by a woman. Anything a man says about it is suspect from the mere fact of his being a man. Nevertheless, at the risk of imminent attack from the whole feminist brigade, and with the hope that women of sensitivity and intelligence will bear me out, I will hazard my opinion. These 732 pages of consideration of women — biologically, psychologically, historically, in myth and in reality, from childhood to old age — show

from beginning to end no understanding whatsoever of woman as human being.

Mlle. de Beauvoir is a spokesman of Jean Paul Sartre's school of French existentialism, which holds that the human fate is complete loneliness in a meaningless world in which the only values are those created by man's activity. Therefore, participation in "production" alone has value. Love is fundamentally meaningless. The meaning of life for each individual is what he *does*. The role of mother is a disgusting one to Mlle. de Beauvoir because it is only "reproductive," not productive; it makes woman an oppressed object mistreated by nature. She can be free only when she escapes the tyranny of motherhood, when she strips herself of all that differentiates her from man. Otherwise she remains man's "privileged prey" — an object, not a free being. It is hard to imagine a concept of woman more devoid of human dignity.

The insight of the great religions and of the myths in which mankind has enshrined its understanding of the common humanity and complementary roles of man and woman, are to her but further expressions of the slavery of woman. But, in the unity expressed by the wisdom of the race in the images of Earth and Sky, Water and Fire, Night and Day, there is no superior and no inferior. Male and female are equally necessary to each other and together form the human spirit.

My Uncle Joseph Stalin. By Budu Svanidze. Translated by Waverly Root. Putnam, \$3.00.

This purports to be an intimate account of Stalin's life as seen by his nephew, who strangely enough lives outside the Iron Curtain in unmolested domestic bliss. Waverly Root, who translates, sponsors and introduces it, seems to have some doubts about its reception. He spends a number of pages arguing for its plausibility and pleading its virtues. There is certainly no gross inconsistency of fact in the account; but most of the dates and events are public property and easily available in any one of a dozen books. What is "new" in Mr. Svanidze's story is the presentation of its hero as a genial, honest, hard-working and devoted leader. The picture that emerges from the intimate tales of private parties, hunting expeditions, conversations with Stalin's daughter, differs from the official Communist portrait only by the addition of minor personal traits, pleasant and unpleasant, and by the admission of differences within the Communist machine. In all the incidents Stalin is seen as a moderate, patriotic, far-seeing statesman.

It would be interesting to know more about Mr. Svanidze. Is the photograph of Mr. Svanidze in 1952 a picture of the same man shown in another photograph as Mr. Svanidze in 1948? How is it possible that the first photograph, which was presum-

ably taken outside the Soviet Union, and the second, which purports to show him with Stalin's granddaughter at Stalin's country estate near Moscow, can both be products of "J. H. K. Press Features"? How did he age so fast, since he presumably did not enjoy the hospitality of one of his uncle's re-educational institutions? Then, how is it that Mr. Svanidze always turns up, purely in a family capacity as a nephew, at so many crucial points in Stalin's career? It is a little like one of those historical novels for young boys in which the small hero somehow manages to be present at all the crises of history.

Can all those who have objectively observed and analyzed Stalin's life and career, as they have deduced it both from events and from personal experience of the man, be so greatly mistaken about his character? Or is it possible that this book is as phoney as it sounds?

***The Sensory Order.* By F. A. Hayek.
University of Chicago Press.
\$5.00.**

Professor Hayek has already contributed greatly to a critique of the loose thinking and hazy utopianism which is characteristic of our time. In his economic works he has been a pillar of strength against the semi-Marxist and Keynesian doctrines of state control of the economic flow, which support the theories of the welfare state. *The Road to Serfdom*

was a powerful demonstration of the incompatibility of "planning" with freedom. In *The Sensory Order* he has entered the field of psychology in order to deepen the foundations of his position.

To the general reader, by far the most interesting part of the book is the final section, where he attacks those mechanistic concepts which tend to equate man with the machine by reducing his personality to a series of physical and biological processes. Basing himself on a careful psychological analysis of the functioning of the brain, Professor Hayek shows that, however far such an analysis can be pushed, it cannot exhaustively explain the human mind. "Our conclusion . . . must be that *to us* mind must remain forever a realm of its own which we can know only through directly experiencing it, but which we shall never be able fully to explain or to 'reduce' to something else." The human psyche is not purely and simply a complex of biological factors, as Freudianism would have it, nor can it be reduced to the operation of material circumstances, as Marxism and the "sociology of knowledge" assert. Its full and deep meaning can only be approached subjectively as well as objectively, intuitively as well as scientifically.

***Abraham Lincoln.* By Herbert Agar. Macmillan. \$1.75.**

The latest addition to Macmil-

lan's series of Brief Lives, this is generally an excellent sketch, marred only by a distorting "liberal" introduction. Otherwise, it is a simple and straightforward picture of Abraham Lincoln, stressing his wisdom and humility, and the efforts he made first to avoid an unnecessary war, and, once it came, to mitigate its impact. The Civil War was very probably avoidable because both North and South believed in the rule of law, however they might disagree on its interpretation, and because their moral and spiritual attitudes were basically the same, despite the institution of slavery below the Mason-Dixon line. Lincoln believed that that institution would eventually disappear as a result of the pressure of the common moral beliefs held by Northerner and Southerner alike. He prosecuted the war only to preserve the Union.

The obvious lesson for today would seem to be directed against those who in their impatience to speed the further enfranchisement of the Negro people would weaken the constitution. Mr. Agar has, however, devoted his introduction to an insidious attempt to draw parallels between the situation of North and South in 1860 and that of the Soviet Union and the United States in 1952. What we should learn from

Lincoln's life, it would seem, is that our contemporary struggle also should be compromised. But between the Soviet state and the West today there is no common moral or spiritual outlook, there is no common belief in the rule of law. On what basis is compromise possible?

***Jefferson Reader.* Edited by Francis Coleman Rosenberger. Dutton. \$5.00.**

Of the making of books on Jefferson there is no end. This one, however, is one of the more lively and instructive, consisting of selections of writings about Jefferson from his own day to ours. The selection is on the whole good, including both favorable and critical passages. But there is one weakness. Jefferson stands for two principles in our national development: popular rule and state's rights. It is unfortunate that it is only the first Jefferson to whom the selections both favorable and unfavorable are directed. Where is the Jefferson of the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions, the Jefferson who regarded government as a necessary evil and the least government as the best government? How is it possible to make up such an anthology, for example, without anything from John Calhoun?



» There's no such hell on earth as that of the man who knows himself doomed to mediocrity in the work he loves. — *Philip Barry*

MERCURY *Reprints . . .*

Freedom's Case Against Dean Acheson

TIME Marches on McCarthy

KOREA: A Positive Proposal

Poison In Every Pot?

What Is "Guilt By Association"?

The Primacy of Politics

How Stalin Can Win

Why American Moderates Should
Support Eisenhower

War Bonds — More Delusions of Security

The Korean Failure

The AMERICAN MERCURY sells more reprints
than any other magazine in America

10 copies	\$1.00	50 copies	\$3.00
25 copies	\$2.00	100 copies	\$5.50
1,000 copies	\$45.00		



THE AMERICAN MERCURY

*11 East 36th Street
New York 16, N. Y.*

Strike back

Cancer strikes one in five

Give to conquer cancer

Mail the coupon to "Cancer"
C/O your local Post Office

American Cancer Society

Your Dollars will save lives
by strengthening the Cancer
Crusade of the American
Cancer Society.

Your Dollars will bring words
of truth and hope to you, to
your family, to your friends
and to your community.

Your Dollars will help ease
the pain of the cancer patient.

Your Dollars will train skill-
ed, understanding hands and
minds to serve in the hospital,
in the doctor's office, perhaps
even in your home.

Your Dollars will speed the
march of research toward
mastery over cancer, the dis-
ease that last year killed
215,000 men, women and chil-
dren.

AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY

GENTLEMEN:

☐ PLEASE SEND ME FREE
LITERATURE ABOUT CANCER.

☐ ENCLOSED IS MY CON-
TRIBUTION OF \$..... TO THE
CANCER CRUSADE.

Name.....

Address.....

City..... State.....